

THE MADRAS LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Thursday, the 29th March 1928.

The House met at 11 o'clock, the President (the hon. Rao Bahadur J. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU Garu) in the Chair.

PRESENT:

Majoribanks, C.I.E., C.S.I., I.C.S., The hon.
Sir Norman.
Usman Sahib Bahadur, The hon. Khan
Bahadur Muhammad.
Moir, C.S.I., C.I.E., I.C.S., The hon. Mr. T. E.
Campbell, C.S.I., C.I.E., C.B.E., I.C.S., The hon.
Mr. A. Y. G.
Subbarayan, The hon. Dr. P.
Muthiah Mudaliyar, The hon. Mr. S.
Seturatnam Ayyar, The hon. Mr. M. R.
Abdul Razack Sahib Bahadur, Khan Bahadur
S. K.
Abdul Wahab Sahib Bahadur, Munsbi.
Adinayrayana Chettiyar, Mr. T.
Anantakrishna Ayyar, Rao Bahadur C. V.
Anjaneyulu, Mr. P.
Arpava Chettiyar, Mr. C. D.
Arogyaswami Mudaliyar, Diwan Bahadur
R. N.
Arupdaswami Udayar, Mr. S.
Basheer Ahmad Sayeed Sahib Bahadur.
Rahktavatsulu Nayudu, Mr. P.
Bheemayya, Mr. J.
Biswanath Das Mahasayo, Sri man.
Boag, C.I.E., I.C.S., Mr. G. T.
Chidambaranatha Mudaliyar, Mr. T. K.
Congreve, Mr. C. R. T.
Cotterell, C.I.E., I.C.S., Mr. C. B.
Dorai Raja, Rajkumar S. N.
Ellappa Chettiyar, Rao Bahadur S.
Ethirajulu Nayudu, Diwan Bahadur P. C.
Evans, C.S.I., I.C.S., Mr. F. B.
Foulkes, Mr. R.
Gangadharan Siva, Mr. M. V.
Gnanavarman Pillai, Mr. P. J.
Gopala Menon, Mr. C.
Govindaraja Mudaliyar, Mr. G. S.
Guruswami, Rao Sahib L. C.
Hamid Khan Sahib Bahadur, Abdul.
Harisarvottama Rao, Mr. G.
John, Mr. V. Ch.
Kaleswara Rao, Mr. A.
Kesava Pillai, C.I.E., Diwan Bahadur P.
Khadir Mohidin Sahib Bahadur, Muhammad.
Koti Reddi, Mr. K.
Krishnan Nayar, Diwan Bahadur M.
Krishnaswami Nayakar, Mr. K. V.
Luker, Mr. A. T.
Mahmud Sohamnud Sahib Bahadur.

Mallayya, Dr. B. S.
Manikkavelu Nayakar, Mr. M. A.
Meera Ravottar Bahadur, K. P. V. S.
Muhammad.
Moidoo Sahib Bahadur, T. M.
Muniswami Pillai, Mr. V. I.
Muppil Nayar of Kavalappara, Mr.
Muthuranga Mudaliyar, Mr. G. N.
Nagan Gowda, Mr. R.
Nanjappa Bahadur, Subadar-Major S. A.
Narayana Raju, Mr. D.
Narayana Rao, Mr. Mothay.
Narayanan Nambudripad, Rao Bahadur O. M.
Narayanaswami Pillai, Mr. T. M.
Parthasarathi Ayyangar, Mr. C. R.
Patro, Kt., Rao Bahadur Sir A. P.
Premayya, Mr. G. R.
Raja of Panagal, C.I.E.
Raja of Ramnad.
Ramachandra Padysobi, Mr. K.
Ramchandra Reddi, Mr. B.
Ramanath Goenka, Mr.
Ramasomayajulu, Mr. C.
Ramjee Rao, Mr. V.
Rangaatha Mudaliyar, Mr. A.
Saha Janandram, Swami A. S.
Saldanha, Mr. J. A.
Sami Venkatachalam Chatti, Mr.
Sarahba Reddi, Mr. K.
Satyamurti, Mr. S.
Shetty, Mr. A. B.
Simpson, Kt., Sir James.
Siva Raj, Mr. N.
Slater, C.I.E., I.C.S., Mr. S. H.
Soundarapandia Nadar, Mr. W. P. A.
Srinivasa Ayyingar, Mr. T. C.
Srinivasan, Rao Sahib R.
Swami, Mr. K. V. R.
Tajudin Sahib Bahadur, Syed.
Tampoe, I.C.S., Mr. A. McG. C.
Venkataramana Ayyangar, Mr. C. V.
Venkataramgam Nayudu, Mr. C.
Venkiah, Mr. S.
Watson, I.C.S., Mr. H. A.
Wright, Mr. W. O.
Zamindar of Gollapalli.
Zamindar of Kalikota.
Zamindar of Seithur.

[29th March 1928]

I**QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.****STARRED QUESTIONS****Agriculture***Output of seed potatoes from the Nanjanad seed farm.*

* 1803 Q.—Mr. V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI: Will the hon. the Minister for Development be pleased to state—

(a) what is the total output of seed potatoes from the Nanjanad seed farm during the past three years;

(b) how much seed was given out to depressed classes and Kotas, a section of the hill tribes, during these years; and

(c) how many enquiries for seed were received from the Kotas during the current official year, and how they were dealt with?

A.—(a), (b) & (c) The Government have no information at hand.

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—“Will the Government be pleased to obtain the information?”

The hon. Mr. M. R. SETURATNAM AYYAR:—“We have called for the information and the report is awaited.”

Redistribution of work between the Deputy and Assistant Directors of Agriculture.

* 1804 Q.—Mr. A. B. SHETTY: With reference to my question No. 436, answered on the 27th of August 1927, will the hon. the Minister for Development be pleased to lay on the table of the House the report the Government have received with regard to the redistribution of work between the Deputy and Assistant Directors of Agriculture?

A.—The report is appended.^a

Co-operative Societies*The working of Adi-Dravida Co-operative Societies in Malabar.*

* 1805 Q.—Mr. V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI: Will the hon. the Minister for Development be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that in Malabar, Adi-Dravida Co-operative Societies are not working satisfactorily, and if so, whether the matter has received the attention of the Government; and

(b) the number of Adi-Dravida Co-operative Societies, credit and non-credit, in Malabar?

A.—(a) & (b) The Government have no information but have called for a report.

Mr. V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI:—“May I know, Sir, when the report will be available?”

* Printed as Appendix on page 208 infra.

29th March 1928]

The hon. Mr. M. R. SETURATNAM AYYAR :—“ We expect to receive the report even to-day and as soon as the report is received, the question will be considered.”

Medical

Separate wards for Adi-Dravida patients in the Women and Children Hospital, Calicut.

* 1806 Q.—Mr. V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI : Will the hon. the Minister for Public Health be pleased to state whether it is a fact that in the Women and Children Hospital, Calicut, Adi-Dravida patients are given separate wards in mean out-houses ? ”

A.—The Government have no information and if any case of hardship is brought to the notice of Government, inquiries will be made.

Mr. V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI :—“ Will the hon. the Minister be pleased to call for the information ? ”

The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—“ If the hon. Member gives one or two definite instances in which women of this class are not properly treated, it will be easy for the Government to enquire.”

Mr. V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI :—“ My question is whether these women are put in separate wards.”

The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—“ I shall call for the information.”

Separation of the post of Principal, Medical College, from Superintendent, General Hospital, Madras.

* 1807 Q.—Mr. A. B. SHETTY : Will the hon. the Minister for Public Health be pleased to state—

(a) what led the Government some years ago to appoint two different officers, one as the Principal, Medical College, Madras, and the other as the Superintendent, General Hospital, Madras, in the place of one single officer who, as the Senior Medical Officer in the Hospital was its Superintendent and at the same time was Principal, Medical College, Madras ;

(b) whether at that time the officer who was the Principal and also Senior Medical Officer was allowed private practice ;

(c) whether he was doing any professional work in the General Hospital apart from supervision and administrative control over the staff in the General Hospital ;

(d) whether the Superintendent, General Hospital, is now allowed to do professional work both in the hospital and outside in his private capacity ;

(e) whether the Superintendent, General Hospital, exercises control over the physicians and surgeons in their professional as well as administrative work in the General Hospital ;

(f) whether the Superintendent, General Hospital, is now doing the work of a First Surgeon, General Hospital, and the work of the First Surgeon is in any way different from the work of the other Surgeons in the General Hospital ;

[29th March 1928]

(g) whether the First Surgeon, General Hospital, was under the control of the then Senior Medical Officer before this post was bifurcated into two as mentioned in (a); and

(h) whether any one is now controlling the work of the First Surgeon, General Hospital, as the Senior Medical Officer was doing at that time?

A.—(a) Prior to 1912, the control of the Madras Medical College and of the General Hospital was vested in one officer, who had neither teaching work in the College nor professional work in the hospital. The absence of facilities for professional work in the hospital combined with a salary smaller than that of Professors led to difficulty in finding a suitable officer to hold the combined appointment. In order to remedy this, the Government decided to abolish the appointment, and to entrust the duties of the Principal to a selected senior professor of the College, and those of the senior Medical Officer of the General Hospital to one of the senior physicians or surgeons of that institution.

- (b) He was allowed only consulting private practice.
- (c) No.
- (d) The Superintendent has to do professional work in the hospital in his capacity as physician or surgeon. He is also allowed consulting private practice.
- (e) The Superintendent exercises only administrative control over the work of the physicians and surgeons in the hospital. He in no way interferes with the professional work of the physicians and surgeons.
- (f) The answer to the first part of the question is in the affirmative. There is no difference in the nature of the work of the three surgeons, so far as their hospital work is concerned.
- (g) For administrative purposes only; in his professional work he was quite independent.
- (h) The Surgeon-General controls the administrative work which the First Surgeon performs in his capacity of Superintendent just as he controlled the work of the former Senior Medical Officer. So far as his professional work is concerned the First Surgeon is in the same position as he was previously [vide answer to clause (g)].

Mr. A. B. SHETTY:—"With reference to clause (d) may I know whether the Superintendent of the General Hospital has any private practice outside the hospital?"

The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR:—"Notice, Sir."

Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA:—"Sir, the reason given by Government for the splitting up of that appointment is that they could not find officers willing to take up that job, because there was no professional work. I should like to ask whether the Government are aware that persons holding this appointment were made Surgeon-General after exhibiting their skill in administrative work. The senior officer of the General Hospital was made Superintendent

29th March 1928]

of the Hospital and Principal of the College and after serving for three years he was promoted as Surgeon-General. There were always men available for this post as long as it served as a stepping-stone to the Surgeon-Generalship. Are the Government now justified in saying that they have stopped that practice because men were not available ? ”

The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—“ Under the circumstances then existing it was thought that this was the proper course. The hon. Member says that after serving for three years as Superintendent of the General Hospital he would become the Surgeon-General ; but it was not considered to be a sufficient bait for these people ”

Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA :—“ Is the hon. Member aware that Surgeon-General Giffard, Symmons and Brown had been all Superintendents and Principals before they became Surgeon-General and it is only now that they are importing an outsider as a Surgeon-General into this Presidency ? ”

The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—“ The facts are as stated.”

Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA :—“ Sir, the Chemical Examiner to the Government of Madras was not allowed private practice ; he stayed for seven or eight hours a day in the premises and for six days in the week. He was given the principalship of the College. Colonel Miller and Colonel Van Gayzel were all Chemical Examiners and Principals of the Medical College. They were not allowed private practice ; the administration was efficient. Now that private practice is allowed, there is slackness in administration.”

The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—“ I am not sure whether this practice leads to corruption in administration. Government thought that this was one line of progress ; and if the hon. Member has any objections he may formulate them.”

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“ May I know, Sir, whether the Superintendent has got quarters inside the General Hospital ? ”

The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—“ No, Sir.”

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“ What are his hours for private practice ? ”

The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—“ Notice.”

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“ May I know whether his hours for private practice are the same as those for his professional work in the hospital ? ”

The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—“ I presume his private practice will be carried on outside office hours in his house. If the hon. Member wants definite information, he must give notice.”

Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA :—“ May I know whether the Superintendent is allowed to have consulting practice in the hospital itself ? ”

The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—“ No, Sir.”

Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA :—“ Therefore any consulting practice during office hours is not countenanced by the Government ? ”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ The hon. Minister has stated that he presumes that it is done outside office hours.”

[29th March 1928]

Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA:—"Is the practice limited to consultation only? Do the Government allow any other practice?"

The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR:—"I can't say."

Fees at the X-ray Institute, Madras.

* 1808 Q.—**Mr. A. B. SHETTY:** Will the hon. the Minister for Public Health be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that out of the fees charged for work done for the private patients both at the X-ray Institute, General Hospital, Madras, and at the King Institute, Guindy, only 20 per cent goes to the Government treasury and the other 80 per cent is being distributed amongst the staff of those institutions;

(b) whether the persons who collect such fees are the subordinates of the officers in charge of the institutions;

(c) whether it is a fact that the grade of pay of the officers in these institutions is higher than that of the same rank of officers working in other medical institutions;

(d) whether the officers and their subordinates in the X-ray Institute, General Hospital, Madras, and the King Institute, Guindy, receive a special pay in addition to their graded salaries;

(e) whether these officers and their assistants are prohibited from private practice;

(f) if the reply to (e) is in the negative, what is the purpose of granting these officers and their assistants a special pay;

(g) why should these officers be doubly remunerated by being given a special pay in addition to the distribution of 80 per cent of the fees earned by the Government in these institutions; and

(h) will the Government consider the advisability of crediting the whole fees earned at the X-ray Institute, General Hospital, and at the King Institute, Guindy, to the Government treasury?

A.—(a) The proportion of the fees credited to the Government is as follows:—

King Institute, Guindy.—Twenty-five per cent of the fees realized from private Bacteriological work.

X-ray Institute.—(i) Twenty-five per cent of the fees paid by private patients who consult Captain Barnard in his private capacity, and

(ii) Fifty per cent of the fees paid by private patients who are sent to the Institute for treatment by their own medical advisers.

(b) The Government have no information as to whether the fees are paid direct to the officers in charge or to their subordinates.

(c) Assistant and Sub-Assistant Surgeons in the King Institute draw higher scales of pay than officers of the same rank in ordinary medical institutions. In the X-ray Institute, no higher scale of pay is given.

29th March 1928]

- (d) Assistant and Sub-Assistant Surgeons in the King Institute do not draw any special pay. The special pay given to other officers is as follows :—

	RS.
Director, King Institute ...	200 a month.
Civil Surgeon, King Institute ...	150 "
Radiologist, X-ray Institute ...	200 "
Assistant Surgeons, X-ray Institute ...	150 "
Sub-Assistant Surgeons, X-ray Institute.	50 "

- (e) The officers employed in the X-ray Institute are not prohibited from private practice. The officers in the King Institute are allowed only special private practice involving the bacteriological treatment of diseases.

- (f) The Radiologist was granted a special pay in view of the large increase in the volume of work in the X-ray Institute since 1922 when his present scale of pay was fixed. The Assistant and Sub-Assistant Surgeons employed in the X-ray Institute are given special pay in view of the arduous and dangerous nature of X-ray work. Special allowances are granted to the officers of the King Institute in consideration of the special nature of the work done by them and the longer hours involved. The Bacteriological Department is a branch of the Medical Department which is cut off from the general line and requires officers who will specialize in the subject throughout their services. In order to render the posts in this branch more attractive, scales of pay have been revised.

- (g) The special pay is given with reference to the officers' official duties. The fees represent their income from private patients, a percentage of which is credited to the Government in view of the fact Government apparatus and materials are used.

- (h) The answer is in the negative.

Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA :—" Is this Radiologist a full-time officer ? "

The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—" I should like to know what he means by a full-time officer."

Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA :—" Just like the Judge of the High Court."

The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—" The Radiologist is not a Judge of the High Court."

Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA :—" I mean in the sense that he should not be allowed private practice."

The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—" He is a full-time officer in the same sense in which other medical officers are."

Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA :—" In the Government departments the medical officers are qualified men, but this Radiologist is only a mechanical X-ray man, not on the medical register."

The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—" He is an expert in his line."

Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA :—" Will they allow a compounder who is an expert in that line to have private practice ? "

[29th March 1928]

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“The question does not arise.”

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“May I know the reason for a higher scale of pay to the officers mentioned in clause (c) ?”

The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—“This is an important matter and the whole thing will have to be examined.”

Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA :—“May I know whether the Government are prepared to credit the fees earned by these men for their practice during the hospital hours to the Government? The Radiologist is carrying on private practice with Government apparatus and Government materials and may I know why the Government allow him to take 80 per cent of the earnings ?”

The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—“The answer says that for the use of the Government materials a certain percentage of the fees is credited to the Government.”

Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA :—“If any private practitioner skilled in X-ray is willing to use the Government materials and give 99 per cent to the Government and take only one per cent for himself, will the Government allow him to do so ?”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“This is a hypothetical question.”

Education

Alleged proselytisation of a Hindu student at Mangalore.

* 1809 Q.—Mr. K. R. KARANT : Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether he has received the information with regard to the alleged proselytisation in the St. Aloysius' College, Mangalore, of a Hindu student to Christianity (vide my supplemental question No. 1057, dated 2nd November 1927);

(b) what further steps the Government propose to take in the matter; and

(c) what objections have Government to include a provision in the Grant-in-Aid Code prohibiting proselytisation similar to the one against political agitation contained in rule 2 of the present Grant-in-Aid Code?

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) The Government understand that the conversion in question was a voluntary act on the part of the pupil and do not accordingly propose to pursue the matter.

(c) Proselytisation does not stand on the same footing as political agitation.

The Director of Public Instruction is being asked to issue instructions to District Educational Officers to see that teachers do not actively engage themselves in the task of converting pupils in schools.

29th March 1928]

Admission of Adi-Dravida children into Cherukunnu Board High School, Malabar.

* 1810 Q.—Mr. V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Local Self-Government be pleased to state whether it is a fact that in the Cherukunnu Board High School in Malabar, Adi-Dravida children are not admitted, and if so, what are Government proposing to do in the matter?

A.—The Government have no information, but they have called for it.

Mr. V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI:—“If, on receipt of the report, the hon. Minister finds that this disability exists, will he take steps to remove it?”

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—“It is a hypothetical question.”

Local Boards

Action taken on the resolution regarding the introduction of a system of voting that will ensure secrecy among illiterate voters.

* 1811 Q.—Mr. R. NAGAN GOWDA: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Local Self-Government be pleased to state what is the result of action taken by the Government on the resolution of this House passed on 31st March 1927 regarding the introduction of a system of voting that will ensure secrecy even among illiterate voters?

A.—The question of securing secrecy of voting by illiterate voters was placed before the Local and Municipal Advisory Committee in August 1927. The Committee were, unable to agree upon any secret method of voting and were of opinion that the existing system should be continued. The matter was accordingly dropped.

Mr. R. NAGAN GOWDA:—“May I know what measures were discussed by the Committee?”

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN:—“The proposals made on the floor of the House by Mr. Biswanath Das and others were considered by the Committee and they thought that it was not feasible to have a satisfactory solution of this vexed problem.”

Mr. R. NAGAN GOWDA:—“May I know what were the methods that were discussed?”

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo:—“May I know what action was taken by the Government on the resolution for the adoption of coloured boxes and symbols to maintain the secrecy of voting?”

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN:—“This matter was discussed by the Local Bodies Advisory Committee, which thought that it was not feasible to adopt those methods.”

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo:—“Was it before or after the passing of the resolution by the Council?”

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN:—“The hon. Member presumes too much; it was only after the resolution was passed by this House.”

[29th March 1928]

Mr. R. NAGAN GOWDA :—“ May I know whether any report was called for from Bombay and Mysore where this system is prevailing ? ”

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—“ No, Sir.”

Mr. P. BHAKTAVATSULU NAYUDU :—“ Do the Government propose to drop the matter there ? ”

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—“ Government have already decided that no further action need be taken.”

Mr. R. NAGAN GOWDA :—“ May I know if the existing method of voting is better than the one suggested ? ”

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—“ Certainly.”

Issue of badges for bus-drivers by the President, Chingleput District Board.

* 1812 Q.—Mr. RAMANATH GOENKA: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that the President of the Chingleput District Board issued badges for bus-drivers and conductors on payment of a fee of Rs. 4 per set and insisted upon their wearing them ;

(b) under what authority the President issued the badges and under what powers he insisted on the drivers and conductors wearing or carrying them ; and

(c) whether this practice has been abandoned, and if so, when and why ?

A.—(a) To the first part of this question the answer is ‘ yes,’ to the second part ‘ no.’

(b) The district board sanctioned the provision of badges. They may be purchased at the option of bus-owners.

(c) No.

The RAJA OF RAMNAD :—“ With reference to the answer to clause (b), may I know whether it is competent for the district board to introduce these badges ? ”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ That is calling for an opinion ”

The RAJA OF RAMNAD :—“ May I know under what authority or power the district board has introduced these badges ? ”

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—“ There is no question of authority or power at all ; the board did it under the residuary powers they possess.”

The RAJA OF RAMNAD :—“ May I know whether these conductors and bus-owners are prosecuted if they do not purchase these badges ? ”

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—“ No, Sir, the purchase of these things is optional.”

29th March 1928.]

Number of buses licensed by the President, Chingleput District Board.

* 1813 Q.—MR. RAMANATH GOENKA: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) the number of buses licensed by the President of the Chingleput District Board (1) in the year 1925-26 and (2) in the years 1926-27 (till 1st February 1927), respectively, for each of the following routes:—

- (i) Madras to Poonamallee via Aminjikarai,
- (ii) Madras to Sripurumbudur,
- (iii) Poonamallee to Avadi,
- (iv) Chingleput to Tirukkalikkunram,
- (v) Tirukkalikkunram to Madras;

(b) the persons to whom, during the said two years (till 1st February 1927) licences were issued for each of the above routes;

(c) the reasons for refusing licences to others who applied for the same for the above routes during the above period;

(d) the amount of licence fee collected for the first three quarters during 1926-27 for each of the above routes and the distance of each of the above routes;

(e) the amount of licence fee charged for the first three quarters of 1926-27 for the following routes and the distance of each route:—

- (i) Madras to Tiruvottiyur,
- (ii) Madras to Saidapet,
- (iii) Madras to St. Thomas' Mount,
- (iv) Madras to Pallavaram;

(f) whether the Government is aware that the President granted monopoly to a particular party for nearly five routes and charged the monopolist lesser licence fees than for others;

(g) whether it is a fact that the District Magistrate of Chingleput received complaints during 1926-27 against the President for refusing to grant licences to certain persons and for granting monopolies to others, and whether the District Magistrate called for remarks from the President in this respect;

(h) whether it is a fact that the Government passed a G.O. Mis. No. 439, L. & M., dated 16th September 1926, pointing out that according to law he could not restrict the number of buses on any road;

(i) whether it is a fact that the President protested against the Government Order;

(j) whether it is a fact that the District Magistrate of Chingleput requested the President to give effect to the Government Order immediately after its issue, and the President replied that he could not do so; and

(k) whether the Government are aware that out of 55 routes classified by the District Board in their resolution, dated 27th January 1927, only 14 routes are open to all, and that the rest are restricted?

[29th March 1928]

A.—(a)—

1925-26. 1926-27.

- | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|
| (i) Madras to Poonamallee via Aminjikarai. | 2 | 1 | |
| (ii) Madras to Sriperumbudur | ... | ... | 6 |
| (iii) Poonamallee to Avadi | ... | 3 | 1 |
| (iv) Chingleput to Tirukkalikkunram. | ... | | 2 |
| (v) Tirukkalikkunram to Madras | ... | 1 | ... |
| (b) The Autocar Speciality Company were given the licences for all the routes. | | | |
| (c) In 1925-26 there was no competition; the number of buses had to be limited owing to the condition of the roads concerned. | | | |
| (d) The fees realized for each of the routes and their distances are given below:— | | | |

Miles.

(i) Rupees 197	11
(ii) Rupees 4,258	23
(iii) Rupees 308	6
(iv) Rupees 460	7½
(v)	9

Fees were charged at the rate of 6 pies or 4 pies per mile according to the miles traversed by each motor vehicle and its seating capacity.

- (e) Fees were charged at the rates referred to in the answer to clause (d) excepting for item (ii) in the case of which no account was taken of mileage within municipal limits.

The distances of the several routes are as follows:—

- (i) One mile.
 - (ii) One and a half miles.
 - (iii) Four miles.
 - (v) Eight miles.
- (f) No.
- (g) Yes.
- (h) The President was told that he could not restrict the number of buses on a road by refusing licence, provided the grant of licence was otherwise unobjectionable.
- (i) The President requested the Government to reconsider their orders.
- (j) The President, District Board, reports that he is not aware of any such correspondence.
- (k) Yes.

29th March 1928]

Levy of licence fees for postal motor vans by the President, Chingleput District Board.

* 1814 Q.—MR. RAMANATH GOENKA: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether the President of the District Board, Chingleput, levied licence fees under section 166 of the Madras Local Boards Act for the postal motor vans engaged by the India Company, Limited, for carrying postal goods for hire from Madras to St. Thomas' Mount and Pallavaram; and if not, why not; and

(b) for how many years these motor vehicles escaped from paying licence fees to the District Board?

A.—(a) The President, District Board, Chingleput, reports that no licence fees were levied on the motor vans carrying postal goods as he did not consider them to be vehicles carrying goods for hire.

(b) Unless fees are due there is no question of escape.

Levy of special licence fees for buses on race days.

* 1815 Q.—MR. RAMANATH GOENKA: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether the President of the District Board, Chingleput, levied special licence fees for buses plying on race days between Madras and Guindy till 1926-27; and

(b) whether he levied similar licence fees for such buses during the current year, and if not, why not?

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) No. All motor buses which plied to Guindy races this year had already obtained permanent licences from the District Board, between Madras and St. Thomas Mount and places beyond.

Collection of tolls by the President, Chingleput District Board.

* 1816 Q.—MR. RAMANATH GOENKA: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that an injunction was granted in December 1927 by the District Munsif of Poonamallee restraining the toll-farmer of the Chingleput District Board from levying toll-fees for buses licensed by the District Board;

(b) whether it is a fact that subsequent to the order of injunction the bus-owners refused to pay the toll;

(c) whether it is a fact that this injunction was set aside on appeal to the District Court of Chingleput and that the case has been taken to the High Court of Madras;

(d) whether it is a fact that the President of the District Board addressed the District Magistrate and the District Superintendent of Police for help to the toll-contractor in collecting toll-fees from bus-owners;

(e) whether it is a fact that the District Superintendent of Police declined to interfere in the matter, and consequently the President insisted upon all bus-owners who applied for renewal of licence that they should pay to the toll-contractor all arrears of toll and undertake to pay, in future, toll-fees without demur;

[29th March 1928]

(f) whether it is also a fact that the President subsequently issued instructions to his office to renew bus-licences for the quarter beginning with the 1st January 1928, only on payment of arrears of toll-fees due by the bus-licensees to the toll-farmer;

(g) whether the action of the President was *ultra vires*;

(h) in how many cases the arrears of tolls due to the toll-contractor was recovered under the President's orders during December 1927 and January 1928;

(i) in how many such cases receipts were granted to the parties concerned; and in how many such cases receipts were not issued;

(j) whether the receipts granted in such cases were such as would be treated as valid under the Madras Local Boards Act; and if not, why not;

(k) whether it is a fact that the District Board Office received payment of arrears of toll-fees in cash;

(l) whether the Government propose to call upon the President to explain why his office received such payments while the licence fees were expected to be paid into the Government treasury, and to account for the payments;

(m) the total amount paid by the President to the toll-farmer, from collections of arrears of tolls due from the bus-licensees;

(n) whether the President obtained a receipt for the payment to the toll-farmer of the arrears collected for him;

(o) whether the above payment was made in cash or refund voucher through the treasury;

(p) whether the District Board have undertaken in their notice announcing auction for the farming out of tolls, that tolls could be levied by the contractor on buses plying for hire with the licence of the District Board; and

(q) whether the Government have received complaints that the President of the District Board has acted illegally as the toll-contractor is a personal friend of his?

A.—(a), (b), (c) & (d) Yes.

(e) & (f) No.

(g) to (o) These questions do not arise.

(p) & (q) No.

Municipal Councils

Collection of land tax by municipalities for wet lands.

11-15
a.m.

* 1817 Q.—Mr. V. RAMJEE RAO: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that the municipal councils have been collecting land tax for the wet lands within the municipal limits in addition to land revenue; and

(b) whether the Government have any intention of employing in the Amending Act contemplated by them, a provision modifying the rule of collecting land tax for wet lands within the municipal limits?

A.—(a) Municipal councils do not collect land revenue. They do, however, collect property tax on wet lands which pay land revenue to the Government.

29th March 1928]

- (b) The property tax is, under the existing Act, leviable at the same rate on both lands and buildings. It is proposed so to amend the Act as to empower municipal councils to levy the property tax on lands at a rate different from that on buildings. It is not intended to exempt altogether agricultural lands from liability to property tax.

Mr. V. RAMJEE RAO : - " May I know, Sir, when the Bill is likely to be introduced ? "

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN : - " The Bill is almost ready now."

Forests

Death of Mr. Ponnayya, Forest Ranger, Cumbum taluk.

* 1818 Q.—Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state in reference to answers given to question No. 795 answered on 21st October 1927, regarding the death of Mr. Ponnayya, Forest Ranger, Cumbum taluk—

(a) who it was that held the enquiry that is referred to in clause (a) of the answer to that question and where;

(b) whether Mr. Ponnayya's wife made a representation to the Collector and whether the villagers of Giddalore sent up petitions to him and the other officers concerned;

(c) what it was that was alleged in the representation and the petitions;

(d) whether the District Magistrate ever held any enquiry at all;

(e) whether it is a fact that the acting Conservator of Forests summoned 14 witnesses to appear at Diguvametta and then desisted from enquiry;

(f) whether the village munsif concerned failed to make a report of the affair and whether the Divisional Magistrate fined him Rs. 2 for it remarking at the same time that the Sub-Inspector who advised the village munsif that he need not send a report was wrong; and

(g) whether any explanation was taken from the Sub-Inspector in this matter?

A.—(a) The Circle Inspector of Police and the Stationary Sub-Magistrate, Giddalore, made the enquiry at Thirumulla and Giddalore, respectively.

(b) & (c) The answer to (b) is that no petition was received by the Collector of Kurnool.

(d) No.

(e) No.

(f) The village munsif was fined Rs. 2, and the Subdivisional Magistrate, Markapur, also remarked in his order that the Sub-Inspector had no business to ask the village magistrate not to make a report.

(g) No.

[29th March 1928]

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO:—“The answer to the question is . . .”

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—“The hon. Member need not read the question and answer.”

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO:—“The answer to clause (b) does not state anything about the representation made by Mr. Ponnayya’s wife. Am I to take it that the Collector did not receive that representation?”

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL:—“The answer has been given already.”

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO:—“May I know with reference to clause (e) whether the Government are aware that 13 villagers of Diguvametta received summons to appear for the said enquiry?”

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL:—“I am not aware of it.”

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO:—“May I know from the hon. the Law Member with reference to the answer to (g) in view of the fact that the Sub-divisional Magistrate, Markapur, did make a statement against the conduct of the Police officer, whether the Government considered that an explanation was not called for?”

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL:—“I shall look into the matter.”

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO:—“May I know with reference to answer to clause (a) whether it was only the Sub-Inspector whose conduct has come into question who conducted the enquiry into the whole matter and whether no other officer enquired on the spot?”

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL:—“The Circle Inspector enquired into the matter.”

Forest grievances of the ryots in Kallikota and Atagada estates.

* 1819 Q.—**Mr. N. SIVA RAJ:** Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received any representations from the ryots of Kallikota and Atagada estates in the Kudala taluk of Ganjam district laying down their various forest grievances;

(b) the number of such petitions sent to them and also to the Collector of Ganjam; and

(c) whether they propose to enquire into the matter?

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) The Government received four such petitions during 1924 and 1925. The Government understand that the Collector of Ganjam has received such petitions from twenty-two villagers since 14th December 1927.

(c) The Government enquired into the grievances brought to their notice and have already passed orders on the petitions sent to them. As regards the petitions received by the Collector, the Government understand that the matter is under enquiry.

29th March 1928]

Forest grievances of the ryots of Dharakota.

* 1820 Q.—Mr. N. SIVA RAJ: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

- (a) whether the Government have received any representation from the ryots of Dharakota (Ganjam district) regarding their forest grievances;
- (b) the reasons why the ryots or their representatives were not consulted regarding the area to be reserved and the species of wood to be prohibited;
- (c) the number of prosecutions launched by the Zamindar of Dharakota or his manager as forest officer after the reservation of the Dharakota forests; and

(d) what steps are proposed to be taken to safeguard the interests of the ryots and also to preserve their old and existing rights?

A.—(a) Yes.

(b), (c) & (d) The Government have called for a report from the Collector of Ganjam.

Mr. C. R. PARTHASARATHI AYYANGAR:—“Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to lay the report of the Collector on the table of the House?”

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL:—“The report has not yet been received. When it is received, the question of laying it on the table will be considered.”

Pensions

Application of Mr. Alwarswami Nayudu for a gratuitous pension.

* 1821 Q.—Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo: Will the hon. the Member for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government received a memorial from Mr. C. Alwarswami Nayudu, till late a computer in the Madras Survey Office, praying for gratuitous pension under Rule 381 (a) of the Civil Service Regulations;

(b) whether this gentleman had an unbroken service of 40 years in the department of which about 34 years was in superior service;

(c) whether his services were appreciated by the heads of departments all along;

(d) whether the Director twice recommended him for a pension;

(e) whether pensions are given to such other servants; and

(f) whether the Government would be pleased to give him a pension under the above provision?

A.—The Government have received a memorial from Mr. C. Alwarswami Nayudu, late computer in the Madras Survey Office, for the grant of a pension under Article 381 (a) of the Civil Service Regulations and the question is under the consideration of Government.

Land Revenue

Tiffin rooms in the Taluk office, Badagara, Malabar district.

* 1822 Q.—Mr. V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state whether there are arrangements in the Taluk office, Badagara, in Malabar, for clerks to take their tiffin and if not, how are they managing to do it now?

[29th March 1928]

A.—The Government are not aware what the tiffin arrangements are for the clerks referred to..

Mr. V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI:—“With reference to the answer, will the Government be pleased to call for the information ?”

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS:—“No, Sir. That is a matter the local officers should see to.”

Loans

Alleged recovery of the loan amount from an Adi-Dravida named Kunhi by the Tahsildar of Calicut.

* 1823 Q.—**Mr. V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI:** Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that in Kovuramsam, Calicut, Malabar district, an Adi-Dravida named Kunhi was given a loan of Rs. 75, and if so, in how many instalments was he permitted to repay the loan ;

(b) whether the Tahsildar of Calicut has ordered the summary recovery of the whole amount, and if so, on what grounds ;

(c) whether the property of Kunhi was attached and sold by the Tahsildar, and if so, for what reason ; and

(d) whether it is a fact that Kunhi has submitted petitions to the Collector of Malabar to withhold the sale, and if so, whether those petitions will be placed on the table and what the Collector has done in the matter ?

A.—(a), (b), (c) & (d) The Government have not received any representation concerning the case and are unable to say whether the facts are as suggested.

Mr. V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI:—“It is stated that the Government did not receive any representation. My question is whether the Collector received the representation. Will the hon. Member ask the Collector whether he received any such representation ?”

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS:—“If the hon. Member is very anxious, I shall do so, but I do not see what good it will do.”

Submission of annual loan statements by the District Collectors.

* 1824 Q.—**Mr. V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI:** Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether, under rules, the District Collectors are to submit an annual ‘Loan statement’ to the Board of Revenue ;

(b) if so, on what date is that statement due ; and

(c) on what dates were the statements submitted by the Collector of Malabar in the years 1924 and onwards ?

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) 1st of October following the fasli year to which the statements relate.

(c) The Government have not the particulars asked for.

Mr. V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI:—“With reference to the answer to clause (c), am I to understand that the Secretariat do not maintain such records ?”

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS:—“No, Sir.”

29th March 1928]

Minor Irrigation

Repairs to tank tunnels of Periyeri and Otteri in North Arcot district.

* 1825 Q.—Mr. M. A. MANIKKAVELU NAYAKAR: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether memorials from the ryots of Mal-Pudupakam, Wallajah taluk, North Arcot district, were received by the District Collector and the Board of Revenue, urging the necessity for repairing the tank tunnels of Periyeri and Otteri and also the repair of the sluice of Periyeri which is alleged to be in a leaky condition;

(b) whether the Government will be pleased to effect the repairs immediately; and

(c) if not, why not?

A.—(a) The Government do not know whether or no such petitions have been received by the authorities named.

(b) & (c) Even if such petitions have been received, that fact alone would not justify the Government in issuing the orders suggested. Inspection will be necessary and the preparation of estimates. The Government have no reason to suppose that the local authorities are not taking such steps, but the question and answer will be forwarded to the Collector.

UNSTARRED QUESTIONS

Education

Opinions of taluk boards regarding the Elementary Education Bill.

1826 Q.—Mr. K. S. SIVASUBRAHMANYA AYYAR: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Local Self-Government be pleased to state whether the Government have called for the opinions of the taluk boards in regard to the Elementary Education Bill and if not, whether they will do so?

A.—The Government do not consider it necessary to consult the taluk boards.

Irrigation

Irrigation tanks connected with Mettur Project canal system.

1827 Q.—Mr. K. S. SIVASUBRAHMANYA AYYAR: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state whether the Government will be pleased to call for and lay on the table the names of all the major and minor irrigation tanks likely to be connected with the Mettur Project canal system in all the villages of Pattukkottai, Arantangi, Mannargudi, Tanjore and Papanamalai taluks with their ayaouts, fishery lease income and the assessment derived by the Government during each of the last ten years and with the enhanced fishery lease and water-rate which can be derived by the Government after the Mettur canal water is introduced?

[29th March 1928]

A.—The villages in the Papanasam and Arantangi taluks will not be commanded by the Cauvery-Mettur project. The collection of the information required in the first part of the question will involve an amount of labour and trouble which the Government do not consider would be justified by the result.

The Government have not investigated and do not propose to investigate the question of the income from fisheries in these tanks. For information concerning water-rates the hon. Member is referred to page 191 of Volume XXV of the Proceedings of the Legislative Council. Whether the rates mentioned there will or will not be finally adopted, the Government are at present unable to say. Mr. Leach's report on the revenue estimates of the project has not yet been finally considered and accepted by Government.

Restoration of village storage reservoirs in Tanjore district.

1828 Q.—Mr. K. S. SIVASUBRAHMANYA AYYAR: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government are aware of the restoration of village storage reservoirs that existed in the old paimash days, and under the pre-settlement Erikattu system for the economic conservation of irrigation water-supplies during the summer and winter seasons in all the river-side villages of the Tanjore district;

(b) whether it is a fact that such useful reservoir sites have been of late assigned away on darkhast to ex-war service men and others, viz., in Varahur, Edayiruppu and other villages in the Tanjore and the Papanasam taluks; and

(c) will the Government be pleased to call for a list of such village storage reservoir sites assigned to ex-service men and others between 1895 and 1927 in the Tanjore district, and lay it on the table?

A.—(a), (b) & (c) The hon. Member is referred to the answer to question No. 567 which was answered on 18th October 1927. If he will be good enough to inform the Government what is implied in the Erikattu system, the Government will endeavour to answer his questions.

Defective irrigation in Sodasudamani.

1829 Q.—Mr. K. S. SIVASUBRAHMANYA AYYAR: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government are aware of the agitation of the Soda-sudamani mirasidars in respect of the defective irrigation caused by the inadequate flow of water in the river; and

(b) if so, to state what the Government propose to do in the matter?

A.—(a) & (b) The Government have received no special representation from the ryots. The fact seems to be that the irrigation under the lower reaches suffers from the fact that the upper reaches are too wide and the sluices draw off more water than is necessary. Action is accordingly being taken to diminish the waterway; the work is in progress and should be finished next year.

29th March 1928]

[*Note.—An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.*]

II

ADJOURNMENT MOTION *in re* THE CARNATIC PAPER MILL.

* Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI :—“Mr. President, Sir, I move the adjournment of the House for discussing a matter of public importance of a definite character, viz., the question of the Government helping the Carnatic Paper Mill, Rajahmundry, under the State Aid to Industries Act to avoid liquidation.”

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“I wish to know from the hon. Member what is the matter of recent occurrence.”

* Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI :—“The Government have taken possession of the Paper Mill and they may sell it under one of the conditions on which money was lent, viz., Rs. 4½ lakhs.”

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“When did the Government take possession of the mill?”

* Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI :—“Within a fortnight. There is an application in the High Court for winding up the whole thing which will come up on the 15th April and if the Government further help the Carnatic Paper Mill, liquidation will be stopped.”

The RAJA OF RAMNAK :—“I understand that the Government have lent Rs. 6 lakhs to the concern. Something like Rs. 20 lakhs have been sunk in it. The High Court is going to be moved for liquidation. Unless the Government look into the matter. . . .”

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“When was the High Court moved?”

* The RAJA OF RAMNAK :—“Within a month; that is my information.”

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“As neither event is of recent occurrence, I must hold that the motion is not in order.”

III

FURTHER DEMANDS FOR GRANTS FOR 1928-29

DEMAND XXIX—CIVIL WORKS (GRANTS-IN-AID).

* The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—“Mr. President, Sir, on the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor, I beg to move

‘that the Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 49,600 under Demand XXIX—Civil Works (Grants-in-aid).’

“This is for the provision of a grant to local bodies in Nellore which have suffered in their communications, roads and buildings so that they may put them in proper order and repair. This sum is required to put communications, etc., in proper order.”

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“The question is ‘that the Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 49,600 under Demand XXIX—Civil Works (Grants-in-aid).’

“The hon. Member (Mr. B. Ramachandra Reddi) who has given notice of a cut motion to point out the inadequacy of the funds allotted is not in his place, and the motion is therefore deemed to have been withdrawn.”

[29th March 1928]

* Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—“Mr. President, Sir, I take it that the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government has satisfied himself with regard to the report that was made by the Collector with reference to one of the taluk boards. We heard on the floor of this House recently from the hon. the Revenue Member that the Collector of Nellore was not alert in reporting the amount required for repairs. That indicates the manner in which the Collector of Nellore went about this business. Before the Government accepted the report of the Collector and declined to make grants to a taluk board, I thought it was necessary that the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government made some reference to the taluk boards themselves to find out exactly the situation. I find also, Sir, that two taluk boards are not to be helped, because it is stated that their financial position is good. I do not understand what the Government mean by saying that the financial position of a taluk board is good. Monies that are given to taluk and district boards are not gloriously magnificent. After the remission of the contribution, some show of liberality is being made. But I cannot state that it is gloriously liberal. The local boards do not have enough funds to meet even ordinary expenditure. That the Government should have refused grants to some taluk boards is an indication which is not very healthy. I thought he would be very zealous about the rights of local boards. I thought he would be equally zealous about the finances of local boards. I thought he would be able to get the largest amount from the Government, especially when Nellore has been so badly affected.

“Again, payments are on post-payment system. The post-payment system has come in for a great deal of criticism and in matters like this the adoption of that system may entail a great deal of delay and trouble on the local boards concerned. Local boards have all along been complaining that the post-payment system does not help them to make easy adjustments or to get easy advances or to get the work done briskly, of the kind they are expected to do within a short interval. I think he would have by this time considered all these questions and I expect him to tell us on what facts, beyond the Collector’s report, he considers that some of the taluk boards are financially sound.”

* The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—“I am glad, Sir, that Mr. Harisarvottama Rao has taken the trouble to point out these facts”

Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—“May I request the hon. Minister to talk more loudly. . . .”

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“It is unfortunate that the hon. Member is so far behind.”

* The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—“The hon. Member should be sitting here. But as he has chosen to sit in a place behind, I shall talk as loudly as possible.”

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“The hon. Member is trying to sit in all places.” (Laughter.)

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—“The hon. Minister must, however, make himself heard.”

* The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—“I shall try to do so. Mr. Harisarvottama Rao has pointed out that there are some taluk boards getting no

29th March 1928]

[Dr. P. Subbarayan]

grants at all under this demand. These grants are being given by way of compassionate grants and naturally when they are compassionate, we have to think of the boards whose finances are not satisfactory to carry through the work of repairing damages caused by the cyclone.

"In Courts of law there is such a thing as *vis major* and we could not provide for all causes of *vis major*. We are trying to do what is possible at this late hour. We have given more than half; the estimate by the district board was Rs. 96,000 and odd and we have given them nearly 53,000 rupees."

Mr. BASHEER AHMAD SAYEED :—"The hon. Minister has no doubt come forward at this late hour with this demand for a paltry sum. I do not see why he should have come at this late hour with a demand for such a small sum when he had the information at his disposal so early as the 7th November 1927. On the 7th November 1927, Mr. B. G. Holdsworth, the Secretary, sent him an enclosure with the general remarks of the Commissioner of Land Revenue and Settlement. From the remarks which I shall presently refer to, I find the cyclone has been very severe. It is nearly six months since the report was sent. I may be permitted to refer to some of these passages."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"Relevant passages."

Mr. BASHEER AHMAD SAYEED :—"Only relevant. The cyclone seems to have been most severe in an area extending over 25 to 30 miles north and south on either side of Nellore town. Its actual centre seems to have been some 10 to 12 miles north of Nellore. At Krishnapatam"

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I am afraid the hon. Member is giving a description of the cyclone. I cannot allow a reference which is not relevant to the discussion."

Mr. BASHEER AHMAD SAYEED :—"The relevancy is this way. As I pointed out, the hon. Minister has come for a paltry sum. The cyclone has been so severe and it may be judged from what I may read."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I do not feel that it is relevant."

Mr. BASHEER AHMAD SAYEED :—"As the President rules, I shall bow."

* The RAJA OF RAMNAD :—"May I ask the hon. the Chief Minister to say what the views of the district board are? It was mentioned yesterday in reply to the hon. Member, Mr. Ramachandra Reddi, that the total amount would be somewhere near Rs. 90,000. The Chief Minister says that the expenditure on this single item alone will be about Rs. 70,000 and the Government propose to give Rs. 40,000 and odd. There must be some discrepancy in the figures mentioned yesterday and to-day. I should like to hear from the hon. Minister as to the resources of the Board and the total grant the Government propose giving."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I am sorry I cannot allow the hon. Minister to make a second speech. Hon'ble Members must make the request for information before the hon. Minister speaks."

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—"Is it not open to the hon. Minister to get the Secretary or some other to answer that?"

[29th March 1928]

* The RAJA OF RAMNAD :—“ Then there is no object in any of us making any speech.”

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ My request is that requests for information may be made before the hon. Minister gets up for his reply.”

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ So we cannot criticise the hon. Minister also ? ”

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ This is only asking for information. If criticisms are offered after the hon. Minister makes his speech the Members cannot get any reply for those criticisms. So they must offer criticism before the Minister speaks. I waited for two or three seconds and no Member got up. Then I called on the hon. Minister.”

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“ If the question arises after the Minister’s speech ? ”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ They suffer.”

The demand was put and declared carried.

A poll was demanded and the House divided thus :—

Ayes.

1. The hon. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur.	19. Mr. V. Ch. John.
2. „ Mr. T. E. Moir.	20. „ Muppil Nayar of Kavallappa.
3. „ Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell.	21. Subadar-Major Nanjappa Bahadur.
4. „ Mr. M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar.	22. Mr. T. M. Narayanaswami Pillai.
5. „ Mrs. S. Muthiah Mudaliyar.	23. „ N. Siva Raj.
6. „ Dr. P. Subbarayan.	24. „ V. I. Muniswami Pillai.
7. Diwan Bahadur P. Kesava Pillai.	25. „ W. P. A. Soundara Pandia Nadar.
8. Rao Bahadur C. V. Anantakrishna Ayyar.	26. „ S. Venkayya.
9. Mr. F. B. Evans.	27. „ M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar.
10. „ H. A. Watson.	28. „ W. O. Wright.
11. „ G. T. Boag.	29. Rajkumar S. N. Donai Raja.
12. „ A. McG. C. Tampe.	30. Mr. S. Arputdaswami Udayar.
13. „ S. H. Slater.	31. „ G. R. Premayya.
14. „ C. B. Cotterall.	32. Rao Sahib R. Srinivasan.
15. „ P. J. Gnanavaram Pillai.	33. Mr. V. Ramjee Rao.
16. „ R. Foulkes.	34. „ C. Gopala Menon.
17. „ A. B. Shetty.	35. The Itaja of Pasagal.
18. „ J. Bheemayya.	36. Diwan Bahadur P. C. Ethirajulu Nayudu.
	37. Khadir Moideen Sahib Bahadur.
	38. T. M. Moidoo Sahib Bahadur.

Noes.

1. Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti.	13. Mr. C. Ramasomayajulu.
2. „ S. Satyamurti.	14. Bisheer Ahmad Sayeed Sahib Bahadur.
3. „ C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar.	15. Mr. P. Bhaktaatsulu Nayudu.
4. „ P. Anjaneyulu.	16. Srikanth Biswanath Das Mahassyo.
5. „ C. S. Govindaraja Mudaliyar.	17. Mr. A. Kaleswara Rao.
6. „ G. Harisarvottama Rao.	18. „ K. V. Krishnaswami Nayakar.
7. „ C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliyar.	19. „ A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar.
8. Abdul Hamid Khan Sahib Bahadur.	20. Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar.
9. Mr. K. V. R. Swami.	21. The Raja of Raonad.
10. „ D. Narayana Raju.	22. Mr. C. R. Partheswarathi Ayyangar.
11. Dr. B. S. Mallayya.	
12. Mr. M. Narayana Rao.	

Ayes 38. Noes 22.

The demand was carried and the grant made.

29th March 1928]

* The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—“ On the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor, I move

‘that the Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,900 under Demand XXIX—Civil Works (Grants-in-aid).’

“ This is for repairs and communications, etc., within the municipal limits of Nellore in respect of damages caused by the cyclone. This is in addition to the half grant of Rs. 20,000 already given.”

* The RAJA OF RAMNAD :—“ May I now ask the hon. Minister, Sir, to give us some idea whether the municipal council is not in a position to find the funds, what the total estimate is, what the damage suffered during the cyclone is and to what extent Government propose to help ? ”.

Mr. C. B. COTTERELL :—“ This grant is not to the district board but to the municipal council. The municipal council was given a grant of Rs. 20,000 during the current year. The council reported that it was unable to spend more than Rs. 14,000 of the grant during the time. Accordingly it requested the Government to allot Rs. 6,000 to be spent in the ensuing year. The six thousand rupees includes the grant we are now considering. The balance of the money was voted last night under ‘Medical’ and ‘Public Health’. The Government have examined the financial position of the municipal council and found that the council could not itself find the money without injury to other services. This extra amount is on account of the damages caused by the cyclone. Government have therefore decided to ask the House for this grant.”

Mr. BASHEER AHMAD SAYEED :—“ Mr. President, this again is a matter of much delay on the part of the Minister. From the same note which I referred to on the previous occasion I find that this information was in his hands much earlier than November last year and for Rs. 2,900 he comes just now. According to the report submitted by the Revenue Department, the loss of life in Nellore alone on account of the cyclone seems to have been 173. I wish to know from the hon. Minister whether he will devote all the time and money at his disposal merely on buildings and toll-gates or whether he will do anything for those people who have become destitute on account of death of relatives and other things.

“ I find, Sir, that a suggestion was made that this amount might be left ^{11-45 a.m.} in the hands of some suitable staff of skilled subordinates who should be placed under the orders of the Collector to deal with the repairs as quickly as possible. I want to know what the Minister proposes to do, whether he is going to leave the repairs to the Public Works Department or whether he is going to appoint a suitable staff to spend some more money and do nothing. Neither the hon. Minister nor his Secretary has told us what has been done with regard to actual relief to the people besides simply attending to buildings, roads, etc. ? ”

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ I may point out that these questions are not pertinent to the grant.”

Mr. BASHEER AHMAD SAYEED :—“ May I ask how exactly he wants to deal with the Rs. 2,900, for what purpose, and under whose direction this amount is going to be left and all that ? ”

* Mr. P. BHAKTAVATSULU NAYUDU :—“ I am afraid that neither the hon. Minister nor his Secretary who has stood up to answer has answered the question of the Raja of Ramnad, whether that municipal board could not

[Mr. P. Bhaktavatsulu Nayudu] [29th March 1928]

help itself to these funds, as it has already got a big amount of Rs. 20,000 and has spent 14,000 out of it and only 6,000 has to be supplemented this year, and for which the hon. Minister comes for that additional grant, of which a portion has already been granted last night, in our absence though, and only Rs. 2,900 is yet to be granted. Why should not this sum the municipal council itself find? That was the question that the Raja of Ramnad asked, which I am afraid is not yet answered. May I know from the hon. Minister or his Secretary whether the municipal council cannot be asked to make its own provision for this paltry sum, instead of coming for a grant to this Council?"

Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO :—“ Mr. President, Sir, the damage caused to the Nellore municipality and the district as a whole by the recent cyclone was appalling. There is no question about it. I should also think that the grants already made by the Council are very inadequate and small. Why a small sum of Rs. 2,900 alone is to be granted now is inexplicable. They ought to have made very large grants, considering the magnitude of the damage done both to people and property by something like an unprecedented cyclone that occurred during the last year. It is also inexplicable why the Minister should be going on in a bargaining spirit, Rs. 20,000 at one time, Rs. 2,900 under a further demand and another 2,000 may be coming up hereafter. Why should not a big amount be sanctioned to enable the municipality to carry on the relief work, improve the roads, streets and drains and restore the town to its previous condition? I therefore think that it is objectionable to give sanction to paltry amounts like this, unless the hon. Minister gets up and satisfactorily explains as to why this sum is necessary and why it should be granted.”

* Mr. C. RAMASOMAYAJULU :—“ Mr. President, if I rise to speak on this motion, it is with a view to make our position clear. We take objection to these grants being brought at this hour of the day, not because we object to moneys being given to local bodies for relief works to be carried on, but because, as the previous speaker has pointed out, we feel that the grants are not sufficient to meet the requirements of the case, and they were not made at the opportune time. It is in that view we express our dissent.”

* The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—“ Mr. President, I see the same tactics as were followed yesterday are being followed this morning also. (Voices: ‘Why not?’ ‘Question.’) You may question but the facts are different. (Voices: ‘I expect you to be graceful in your remarks.’ ‘What are the tactics you are following?’) As Mr. Cotterell has explained, a sum of Rs. 20,000 was placed at the disposal of the Nellore municipal council and they have not been able to spend this amount and this is being put forward to supplement what has been given. The sum that has been granted not being spent will lapse at the end of the financial year and they want the sum of Rs. 6,000. They have spent Rs. 14,000 and they want the other Rs. 6,000 at the beginning of the next year. That is the reason why this amount is asked for.”

The demand was put and carried and the grant was made.

* The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—“ Mr. President, Sir, on the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor, I beg to move

‘that the Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 11,600, under Demand XXIX—Civil Works (Grants-in-aid).’

29th March 1928]

[Dr. P. Subbarayan]

"This item is a peculiar demand. This is due to the fact that the Coimbatore district board gave a sum of Rs. 23,223 to the Coimbatore and Gopichettipalaiyam taluk boards for expenditure on village roads expecting that they would get a grant from the Government which has not been made. Now they want to recoup that amount out of the amount which is given this year, to adjust their accounts in a proper manner. We have told the district boards that they should not do this sort of thing in future, but that they should wait for grants from Government. As an exceptional case, I hope the House will not object to the passing of this grant."

* Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :— "I only want to say one or two words with reference to what fell from the hon. the Minister, that it is a peculiar question. On the contrary, I urge on the Government the necessity of making this a rule instead of an exception. We have been here complaining over and over again of the way in which these grants are made practically at the end of the year and how large portions are taken back. What is given by the right hand is taken away by the left. It acts as a great obstacle to local bodies and prevents them from taking up any works. Moneys are sanctioned at the end of the year on condition that they should finish the works for which the moneys are granted, otherwise the moneys will lapse. Naturally the local bodies do not like to submit to these conditions. That is the reason why year after year large amounts are allowed to lapse. Then, the Government representatives get up and say 'Oh, we sanctioned several lakhs to local bodies but the local bodies are not able to spend these sums, therefore they are lapsing.' We have been urging that such tactics should go. The local bodies may be given lump grants, so that if they are called upon at any particular period to pay half and finish the works, there should be no question of lapsing. Several district boards are in the unfortunate position of not being able to do any work at all. Instead of thanking the Coimbatore district board for taking a bold stand and pointing out to the Government their mistake in allowing such things, the hon. Minister gets up and says that it is a peculiar position and that district boards have been warned to be more careful hereafter, and as a special case this money is to be given to the Coimbatore district board. We do not want any special favour, for such things happen on account of the mistaken policy of the Government. The district board took the risk and advanced the money and then asked Government to reimburse it. But the Minister says that it is a peculiar case.

"I think we have agitated over this question long enough, and I hope the Minister will take into consideration our suggestion and instead of making these grants last only for a few months, he must adopt the policy of giving block grants running for years. So, if the Government are earnest in the improvement of water-supply and communications in rural areas, they should adopt the above suggestion. I expect the hon. the Minister to move forward and thank the district board for pointing out the correct way and setting an example to the Government." (Hear, hear.)

Mr. BASHEER AHMAD SAYEED :— "Sir, I want to oppose this demand. I wish to point out the discrepancies in the way in which Ministers are doing their business. The explanatory note says that the Coimbatore district board advanced a sum of money to the Coimbatore and Gopichettipalaiyam taluk boards in 1926-27. Now, we are dealing with the budget for 1928-29. What did the Government do these years? Did not the Coimbatore district

[Mr. Basheer Ahmad Sayeed] [29th March 1928]

board ask for reimbursement of half the amount they had advanced? When did the Minister receive the application from the district board? Certainly he must have received the application from the district board soon after the district board made the advance. What was the department doing all these one and a half years and more? Why are they coming so late as 1928 for reimbursing this small amount? I wish to know the reason for the delay in this matter. This does not speak well of the way in which the department is carried on. They could have included the money in the budget of 1927-28 or at least in the recent budget, which is still under the consideration of the House. I want to know from the Minister what exactly is the reason for this delay. The explanatory note does not state how exactly the thing happened. I hope the Minister will make a straightforward answer as to how the delay was caused, why it was caused and who was responsible for it."

12
noon

Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO :—“ Mr. President, Sir, there seems to be something behind this. (a voice : confusion.) Otherwise why should there be such a delay from 1926-27? The money was spent by the Coimbatore district board in the expectation that they would recoup it from the Government soon. There was the revised estimate and afterwards the budget for 1927-28 was passed. Why the district board was not given that amount by the Government is not known and no supplementary demands were made for this amount. If that was really an important and serious thing and if the Government thought that they had a duty to the Coimbatore district board, they ought to have reimbursed it and come to us for a supplementary demand in 1927-28. Again there is the budget of 1928-29. In that also no provision has been made. What is the necessity for this further demand. . . ? ”

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ I am afraid the hon. Member is repeating the questions of Mr. Basheer Ahmad.”

Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO :—“ I am trying to impress, Sir, more on the hon. the Minister.” (Laughter.)

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ Repetition does not amount to impressing a thing.”

Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO :—“ Therefore, Sir, the Government should not have come forward with this further demand at this stage. Of course I do not say that I won’t oppose it, but I oppose it because it is too late and steps were not taken in time either by the district board concerned or by the Government. More than two years have elapsed and whosoever was the defaulter, there has been neglect and delay. Therefore, I think, that unless the hon. Minister comes forward with a very satisfactory explanation that would satisfy this House, this demand ought to be rejected by this House.”

* Diwan Bahadur P. KESAVA PILLAI :—“ Sir, I heartily support this motion, but I would endorse every word uttered by my hon. Friend on the opposite bench. I only wish that Government should behave better in making grants in time so that the boards may be able to spend properly before the close of the year.”

* The RAJA OF RAMNAD :—“ Sir, I will also follow the same policy pursued by my hon. Friend Diwan Bahadur Kesava Pillai and support the demand, but I would make another request of Government and that is to

29th March 1928]

[The Raja of Ramnad]

place all applications for grants before the Advisory Committee of the Local Self-Government Department and have the claims of several local bodies duly considered without the same being disposed of in the secretariat. If they do it, I think it would go a great way to lessen the hardship which the boards feel in the matter of getting grants."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I thought there were two or three more presidents of district boards who have not yet spoken."

* The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—"Mr. President, I was surprised at the attitude taken by my hon. Friend from Coimbatore Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar, because I thought he was very jealous of the powers of this Council; and if such a system as he recommends is adopted it would mean that we are taking away the powers of this House of voting grants and placing them in the hands of the district boards and the local bodies concerned. They spend the money first and afterwards come up and say that they have spent the money and the Government should allot the money, for they had already spent it. That was the objection that I was referring to when I said that this is peculiar in the sense that we are asking for the vote of the House for a sum that has already been spent. I have heard what the hon. the Raja of Ramnad said. As a matter of fact, last year these grants were brought forward before this House at the beginning of August. Mr. President, you are also aware, as also other hon. Members, that these grants could not be proceeded with and grants had to be postponed from day to day and had to be considered only on the 1st of November when it was too late for the local boards concerned to utilise the amounts placed at their disposal. But now we will see that these sums are allotted early, so that the local boards can spend the sums that have been allotted to them in a manner acceptable to the people of the locality, to improve the communications that are necessary. I am thankful to the hon. the Raja of Ramnad for the suggestion that he made and we shall see if we can get a meeting of the Advisory Committee in time to place these proposals before them, so that the various district board presidents who will be present in that committee may say what are the needs of the various districts concerned."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The question is that Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 11,600 under Demand XXIX—Civil Works (Grants-in-Aid)."

The demand was put to the House and carried and the grant was made.

DEMAND XXX—CIVIL WORKS—TRANSFERRED.

The hon. Mr. M. R. SETURATNAM AYYAN :—"Mr. President, Sir, on the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor, I move

'that Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 28,200 under Demand XXX—Civil Works—Transferred' for the purchase of a house as residence for the District and Sessions Judge, Masulipatam.

"Sir, for the last three decades the District Judge of Kistna has been occupying a bungalow conveniently situated and adjacent to the District Court premises. The owner of the building is willing to sell the property for Rs. 23,000. Some initial repairs have to be made and the whole scheme comes to Rs 28,250. The purchase and the repair of the present bungalow will certainly cost less than the construction of a new one. Further I learn

[Mr. M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar] [29th March 1928]

that no other building or site is so conveniently available for the purchase. I also wish to bring to the notice of the House that this amount of Rs. 28,250 has already been sanctioned for the current year but in view of the technical formalities connected with the Land Acquisition Act, the transaction could not be completed and the award passed before 31st March 1928 and therefore the grant has to be moved for the next year. Hence the demand for further grant."

Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI :—“ Mr. President, Sir, I beg to move the following motion :—

‘to reduce the allotment of Rs. 28,200 for the purchase of a house as residence for the District and Sessions Judge, Masulipatam, by Rs. 100.’

“ This is to discuss the desirability of and necessity for purchasing the house in question.”

“ Sir, my aim in moving this motion is to discuss the necessity of purchasing this building. The hon. Minister in charge of this department has said two things : that the house is favourably situated, and that the District Judge has been there for the last three decades and it may not be possible at any time in the future to purchase the House which is so favourably situated. Altogether he made out three points in asking for this grant ; in the first place I oppose any purchase of buildings for District Judges and officers of that sort. It is not necessary for a District Judge to be favourably situated. I cannot understand the reason why he should live in a building which is very favourably situated. He is not a Commander-in-Chief or a District Superintendent of Police, so that in times of necessity or at any hour of the day he could gather his men and do the necessary work such as putting down a rebellion or a riot. A District Judge has to attend the Court by 11 a.m. regularly and quietly do the work and go out at 5 o'clock and that is all he has to do. He is very decently paid and it is for him to look out for a building which suits his liking. Now large sums are being spent for purchasing buildings for District Judges and compelling them to live in a particular place and making them pay a certain percentage of their pay towards the rent for the building. I put several questions relating to this and elicited that more than a crore of rupees have already been invested in purchasing building like this and the interest that is realizable from this investment is about one per cent and odd. Whatever it may be there is the least urgency or necessity for purchasing a building like this. There are police constables without buildings and for the matter of that even in the civil departments, sub-judges and munsifs and other officers are not given the use of any buildings. In the explanatory note it is stated that the cost of the building is Rs. 23,000. It is not that the building is being purchased by any other person and the Judge is losing the advantage of living in that house. It seems the owner of the house has consented to part with the building for Rs. 23,000. It is the Government that moved in the matter first and asked the owner whether he would part with it. The repairs and certain additions which are proposed to be made comes to about Rs. 4,000 or Rs. 5,000. If you go on spending money on these things where will we come to. My submission therefore to this House is that it is not at all necessary to provide officers getting high salaries with buildings. It is for them to find out buildings for themselves. Now it may be said that if the officer could not get suitable accommodation in the locality, perhaps it may

29th March 1928] [Mr. K. V. R. Swami]

be very difficult to discharge his ordinary duties. It cannot be put on any other ground at all. (Mr. G. Harisarvottama Rao: His brain would be affected.) I won't go to that extent. The hon. Minister said that it may not be possible to find any suitable building for purchase. I may point out that Masulipatam is not an out-of-the-way place. In Masulipatam we have got a number of buildings. From 1860 there are many buildings which are not occupied by anybody, because it was once upon a time a port. Another thing which the hon. Minister very cleverly says is that it may not be possible to find out as suitable a building as the present building. That is, he thinks that just like a kitchen is attached to a house, the District Judge's house also should be attached to the court. That seems to be his idea. In very many places the District Judges do live far away from courts and they do attend the court and do their ordinary duties properly.

"Another point raised is that this grant was made already by this House. When this grant was made I don't think that all these facts were placed before this House. So far as my party was concerned we were not here at all. I submit that a grant for Rs. 28,000 for a building for the District Judge who gets between Rs. 1,500 and Rs. 2,000 and more, is not at all necessary. It is not even suggested by the hon. Minister that the District Judge very much wants this house because he cannot live in any other house as he has been living in that house for three decades. The same officer has not been living in that house for all the three decades so that sometimes you have got the superstition of desiring to live in the old houses. Perhaps, the District Judge of Masulipatam has also got that superstition and wants to continue in that house. But, Sir, it is given as a reason that he has been living there for the past three decades and therefore it is necessary that the same house should be purchased now, at a high cost. So I move this motion."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I feel a certain difficulty in the matter. The grant was made by the House for expenditure during the current year as a supplementary demand. I understand that the amount was not spent or could not be spent on account of delay in the land acquisition proceedings. Now Government want to have this amount utilized for the year 1928-29. That is the reason why they came forward with a further demand. The question now is the supplemental demand having been granted by the House, whether you can go into the merits of the question. Of course, the House has the right to vote it down or grant it as a demand but I do not know whether, when once the vote has been given, you can go into the merits of the question as to whether it is desirable that such a purchase should be made or not. I should like to hear the views of the various members."

* Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"Sir, if we have the power to vote it down or grant it, have we not got the power also to convince others that we are in the right in so doing. Unless you rule on some technical ground, on some standing order that because this matter has been once discussed and the decision of the Council given thereon, it is *res judicata* I think we have got the right to discuss the question."

Mr. BASHEER AHMAD SAYEED:—"Is there *res judicata* in the Council also?"

12-15
p.m.

[29th March 1928]

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ Cap we now go into the merits ? ”

* Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“ Once you rule that we have the power to vote for or against the motion, I beg to contend that we have also the power to try and convince other members of the House to agree with us and vote with us. If once for all you say, this can be voted only one way and . . . ”

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ No, I cannot say that. The only question is whether we can go into the merits of the question.”

* Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“ I do not know, Sir, whether there is any distinction.”

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ Because this was adopted recently in another place, there may be a similar rule in our Council also.”

* Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“ I think, Sir, the policy should not be gone into again. It has been so held in other places also. There is now no question of the Government having any distinct policy. Some of us may support the Government policy but here is the question in this particular case, whether this particular bungalow should be purchased for this particular sum and that seems to be a question of fact and there is no question of policy involved. It is only a question of fact that is involved in it and I submit that if we are entitled to vote I think we are equally entitled to speak on it.”

* Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI :—“ Sir, the hon. the Minister himself has gone into the merits of the question. He spoke as to why this grant should be made. If he had simply said to this House ‘ Please make this demand ’, that would have been a different thing. But he has stated his reasons as to why this grant should be made. Therefore we will be within our rights in showing that these arguments are not correct and the House should not be guided by them.”

The hon. Mr. M. R. SETURATNAM AYYAR :—“ I said all that more for the information of the Swarajists who were then absent.”

Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI :—“ Then we insist on our rights because we were absent then.”

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ I think it is safe to allow the discussion on the motion in this particular case because the supplementary demand was voted for expenditure in 1927-28 whereas this is a demand for 1928-29. In view of this essential distinction, I allow this discussion.”

Mr. S. Satyamurti rose in his place to speak.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ I have allowed this discussion.”

* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ I want to raise another point of order, Sir. May I now ask for a ruling whether the further demands which you have now ruled are in order, cover cases also of expected lapses of grants which the House has already voted upon for this year ? The facts of this case are as have been brought to the notice of this House by a reference to the previous proceedings, whether in this year, which is not yet over, a particular sum was voted by this House as a supplemental demand and the Government expect that by the 1st April next that is three days from now, owing to certain causes, the grant will not have been spent and the grant will lapse. The point of order that I am raising for your ruling is whether with regard

29th March 1928]

[Mr. S. Satyamurti]

to a sum already voted upon for a particular purpose, and a grant voted by this House as a supplemental grant for the year on the assurance of the Government that grant would be spent before the end of the year, the Government can again come forward to this House and say, 'We want a further demand of that very same sum which has already been voted upon.' My difficulty, Sir, is this: to-day so far as we are concerned, the money has been voted and that voting is valid till the midnight of the 31st March. If to-day, Sir, the House again votes this sum, technically it means that we have two sums of money for the same purpose, the original supplemental demand and the further demand, and it is open to the Executive to buy two bungalows. It is not as if the Executive may not do it. The Executive has been known to do worse things. The hon. the Revenue Member laughs. There is no use in laughing. We have to test these things by the law of it. Is this House going to vote two amounts for the same purpose when the original grant has not lapsed and will not lapse till 12 o'clock in the night on the 31st March? I submit, Sir, that certainly even if further demands are in order, this is a serious inroad on all financial canons of propriety because the Government anticipate a possible lapse three days later, but yet ask the House to commit this error of voting for the same grant two sums under the head of further demands and supplemental demands. These further demands, I am sure, will give rise to all these troubles. That is why I think they ought to be provided for under certain rules which I suggested the other day. I think this is a case in which the Government are wholly out of order, and I ask for your ruling on the matter."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"Has the hon. the Finance Member anything to say on this point of order?"

* The hon. Mr. T. E. MOIR :—"Mr. President, Sir, the hon. Member for the University has suggested that our procedure is wrong. May I point out, Sir, that only a few minutes back the House voted a sum of Rs. 6,000 on the ground that a district board could not spend it in this year and therefore a further grant was made by the House of that sum of Rs. 6,000 in order that the district board may be in a position to spend it in the year 1928-29. This case is exactly on all fours with that. If it was regular in one case, it seems to me that it is regular in the other case as well and that the objection of the hon. Member for the University has been taken too late."

* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—"On a point of order, Mr. President, I think there is no such thing with regard to points of order, as *res judicata*. I can take a point of order whenever I choose."

* The hon. Mr. T. E. Moir :—"I have not said, Sir, that the hon. Member could not raise this point of order. I only said that he has raised it too late. If his arguments were invalid on a previous grant made by this House, they would be equally invalid now. But, of course, the only procedure by which the Government or this House can provide for expenditure which it has already sanctioned being met in a case where the House has been informed that that expenditure cannot be made within the limits of the existing financial year is by the Government coming and asking for a further demand for the coming year. And that is what has been done in this case. I do not know if the argument of the hon. Member for the University is that these further demands ought not to have been raised now;

[Mr. T. E. Moir]

[29th March 1928]

but that a supplemental demand should have been made some four or five months hence, when the next meeting of the Council takes place. But might I point out, Sir, that when an award has been passed under the Land Acquisition Act, it is, as in the cases of all obligatory payments on the part of the Government, a fixed rule that such payments cannot be avoided and that payment must be made when the demand is presented. We cannot refuse to meet that demand from the owner of property we have bought when he puts it forward and claims to be paid and therefore in order to regularise procedure when the claim for payment is made, we have to ensure that the disbursing officer is placed with funds for the purpose and this is what we are doing. I urge, therefore, that both our procedure and this demand for a grant by this House are perfectly in order."

Mr. P. Anjaneyulu rose to speak.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Is it anything on the point of order ? "

Mr. P. ANJANEYULU :—" On the merits, Sir."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI :—" Sir, may I submit that the hon. the Finance Member's argument does not go in support of the position he has taken ? He merely points out that a previous neglect of raising a point of order might be also adopted in respect of this case. The one point I wish to mention to you is this : that he has said that the award having been passed the payment was necessary. But in the explanatory note, it is put down that 'the Collector of Kistna has now reported that the formalities required by the Land Acquisition Act cannot be completed and the award passed before the 31st March 1928.' Therefore, it can very well stand over till the next meeting of the Council."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The danger pointed out by the hon. the Member for the University that there is a chance of two buildings being purchased is not, to my mind, convincing, because in the note it is clearly stated that the supplemental grant voted by the House will not be spent. As to why the Government came forward with the supplemental demand and why it was not utilized within the year, is more a question which is within the province of the Public Accounts Committee who can take the concerned officers to task as to why the demand was made and was not utilized within the year. The lapses form a proper ground for examination by the Public Accounts Committee and the House will have ample opportunity to express its opinion when the Public Accounts Committee examines the question and submits its report to the House. Regarding the further demand, I feel that it is in order under the present circumstances."

Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO :—" On the merits of the question, Sir. Mr. President, I oppose this motion for a grant of Rs. 28,200 for purchasing a bungalow for the District and Sessions Judge of Kistna district. In Masulipatam buildings are available in plenty for any officer to occupy for rent, which is cheap. There are plenty of bungalows for rent and I do not see any reason why a bungalow should be purchased. Particularly, Sir, after the cyclone the site has been damaged and many of the old buildings have taken a dilapidated appearance. This building is not a new one built later on, but it is an old one. Of course, it is somewhat near the District Court. It has been occupied by the District Judges, whoever the incumbent was, for a long time and before that by somebody else. If steps are taken

29th March 1928] [Mr. A. Kaleswara Rao]

to construct a new building, I daresay, that it would cost less than the amount now demanded and perhaps a neater and more comfortable and suitable and convenient building could be constructed.

"Lands are cheap, there, Sir, and we can get plenty of land at very low prices, unlike in towns like Bezwada or Rajahmundry where the cost of sites is very high. Therefore, without much inconvenience, if really a building is found to be necessary, one can be built; at the same time I do not see why a permanent building is necessary. Some time ago there were proposals to shift the headquarters of the district to some more central place like Bezwada—I should not be understood as pleading for it—and some changes may also take place in the future. I do not approve of the policy of the Government to build pukka permanent buildings for officers to live in, especially in places where bungalows are available. I would request the hon. the Minister to tell us what it would cost to build a pukka building and how the purchase of this building is more advantageous from a financial point of view. I submit that no permanent building is necessary, but if it is really found to be necessary, an old-fashioned building might be purchased now instead of constructing or buying a building in a modern style to be used conveniently by the District Judge and his family. Sir, probably in this case the owner of the House will be in an advantageous position. I do not want to attribute motives, but what I feel is that this will be an advantage to the owner of the House; he may be getting very little rent now. I therefore want to know who the owner of the house is, what rent he is being paid now, whether it is Mr Maiden's bungalow, etc. If it belongs to Mr Maiden, I know he is an European not in very good circumstances now. Anyhow on principle and in the circumstances of the case, I think it is not necessary or desirable to purchase this bungalow. Unless the hon. the Minister is able to satisfy us on these points and explains to us the relative values of a pukka building to be built and the building now to be purchased, I think this grant should be vetoed. I have great pleasure in supporting the cut motion of my hon. friend Mr. Swami."

* Mr. C. RAMASOMAYAJULU :—"Sir, I wish to deal one by one with the grounds which are said to be behind this proposal. In the first place it is said that the bungalow is conveniently situated, being near the District Court. May I point out to the House, Sir, that this is no ground to be taken into consideration in the case of an officer who can command conveyance and who will be in a position to pay for any conveyance? I can understand such an argument in the case of poor-paid clerks, but I cannot understand it in the case of a very well-paid officer. So, that ground cannot stand for a moment.

"The next ground brought forward is that 'the purchase and repair of the present bungalow will cost less than the construction of a new one and such new bungalow cannot be so conveniently situated as the present one'. With reference to this, may I point out that the explanatory note here does not help the Council at all in ascertaining what the real value of the present bungalow is? The note says that the 'owner is willing to sell the property with the out-houses, etc., for Rs. 23,000'. That is the demand made by the owner of the house; but there is no reference to the value of the property. The note does not contain anything to show that the Government have investigated into this and come to the conclusion that Rs. 23,000 is the proper market value of the house. All that the note says is that the

[Mr. C. Ramasomayajulu]

[29th March 1928]

owner is willing to part with it for Rs. 23,000. I think the owner is really in a vantage position in making the demand and it seems that if he makes the demand we are bound to pay it. Otherwise, I cannot understand why there is nothing in the note to show what the proper value of the bungalow is. Of course there is the additional statement that 'the initial repairs will cost Rs. 4,000 and the cost of construction of two servants' quarters is estimated at Rs. 1,250'. That is all very good so far as it goes; but when we do not know the market value of the property, the owner may demand anything he chooses and we must be prepared to face the situation. Unless the position is explained, I do not see how we can go in for this property at such high value.

" My further point is that it has not been explained how much rent we have been paying for this house to the owner up to now. From that at least we could have arrived at the market value of the property roughly; but when even that is not available to us, it will not be wise for us to proceed.

" The note also says that 'the formalities required by the Land Acquisition Act cannot be completed and the award passed before the 31st March 1928'. I cannot understand this. If it is a question of the whole proceedings under the Land Acquisition Act being carried on, that is quite a different matter; but if the house is to be purchased for a fixed price, I don't think much time will be taken in completing the transaction. If it is a case of giving convenience to the poor-paid clerks by purchasing for them a building near the office, then I would vote for this certainly, but in the case of a well-paid officer who will be quite in a position to pay for conveyance charges, I do not see the necessity for purchasing the bungalow, and I therefore oppose this motion."

* Mr. K. KOTI REDDI :—“ Mr. President, Sir, if I oppose this motion, it is not so much on the merits of the particular item of property that is now proposed to be bought by the Government, but it is on the ground of the general policy that is being pursued by the Government in connexion with residential buildings for officers. Sir, I am one of those who have been complaining in this House that this sort of investment by Government on residential buildings of officers has not been considered with a view to get a fair return on the investment. I once or twice questioned in this House what interest was realized by the Government on the investment on these residential buildings, but so far, I have not been able to get the information. I want to know from the hon. the Minister—and if he is not in a position to say, from the hon. Finance Member at any rate—what the rent is that is taken from the Government officials and what is interest secured on the outlay on these buildings. That is a question, Sir, of very great importance, which we must take into consideration before we sanction any amount of money for residential quarters for Government officers. Of course there are certain cases where the Government do not get any rent from the officials, for instance, in the case of residential quarters for constables, for sub-inspectors and officials of that type; but that is a different matter. Admittedly the Government are getting something in the way of rent from buildings of the type now proposed to be purchased. In such cases, I want to know whether the Government are making any profit. I believe they are not; and if so, are not the Government losing heavily on these buildings? That is a question which is very important to us now.

29th March 1928]

[Mr. K. Koti Reddi]

"Secondly, Sir, before the Government launch on purchasing or building residential quarters for officers, one thing should be considered, and that is : we have been agitating in this House for the decrease of salaries in the case of higher officers. Whether effect is going to be given to that immediately or not, I believe the day is not far off when, if more Indians occupy the posts now occupied by Europeans, they ought to be satisfied with much less salary than is being paid at present to the officers in the various grades. I am only saying this with reference to the officers drawing more than Rs. 300 or Rs. 400. This point is important in this connexion ; because even if the Government do not lose anything on the buildings now, they would get much less as rent from the officers when, some time later, the same proportion of their salaries, as rent is to be recovered from them with reference to their reduced salaries. That is why I say the Government should think twice before launching on buildings for residential quarters for officers.

"There is another point also, Sir, which should be taken into account in this connexion. As my friend Mr. Kaleswara Rao pointed out, there was a proposal some time ago to change the headquarters of the district from Masulipatam to some other central place like Bezwada. As a matter of fact, proposals have often been made in this Council and elsewhere to change the headquarters of the districts, the taluks and revenue divisions. When such a change comes, the buildings which have been bought or constructed by the Government in the present headquarters will be practically of no use. You remember, Sir, that two or three years ago a proposal was made to abolish the Cuddapah district altogether, and if that had taken place, the buildings at Cuddapah would have been of no use now. Therefore, what I say is that before the Government launch on purchasing these buildings for officers, they must think twice, because when the headquarters are changed, these buildings may not be useful at all. Unless there is an urgent and absolute necessity, I don't think it is desirable that the Government should buy any building. Now, let us see whether there is a real necessity in this case. It is admitted in the note that the building has been in the occupation of District Judges for the last three decades, but there is no information to show that the owner is not willing to rent it in the future also. I have now put forward some considerations before the House from which we can conclude that unless there is an absolute necessity for the Government to buy this building, they ought not to do so.

"Sir, I submit unless there is any absolute necessity there is no cause for the purchase of the building simply because it has been occupied by the District Judge for the last so many years. I don't see anything here to the effect that the present owner is unwilling to rent it."

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL :—"He is not willing to rent the building."

* Mr. K. KOTI REDDI :—"If he is unwilling to rent it, there are other buildings available for rent.

"Secondly, Sir, I am told that the rent paid by the District Judge is not more than Rs. 100 and if that were so if the Government spent this sum on it, they will lose heavily, as the interest on this sum will be about Rs. 140 or Rs. 150.

"Thirdly, Sir, even if the Government launch on this building programme, they must first of all satisfy the requirements of officials whose need

[Mr. K. Koti Reddi]

[29th March 1928]

is more urgent than that of the Judicial officers. There are several instances of officers drawing a low salary and suffering for want of accommodation. I know of a taluk place by name Allagadda in the Kurnool district where married officers hesitate to go as they cannot get accommodation. And I do not know what steps Government have taken to give them accommodation. What I say is, even if the Government think that residential quarters ought to be built for its officers by all means let them do so; but before launching on it let them first provide accommodation to the officers whose need is great. I knew the amount spent on the building for the District Judge in Cuddapah is Rs 60,000; and as compared with that this sum is very small. When the policy of the Government is not satisfactory, we cannot vote for items of this type unless it be that there is absolute necessity as in places where it is impossible to get buildings for rent or in cases of officers drawing a salary of about Rs. 100."

At this stage Diwan Bahadur P. Kesava Pillai rose to speak.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“I suppose the hon. Member now speaking has not finished his speech.” (Laughter.)

Diwan Bahadur P. KESAVA PILLAI :—“I beg to move that the question be now put to vote.”

MR. BASHEER AHMAD SAYEED :—“Mr. President, when a member is actually on his legs, how can another member move for a closure, Sir?”

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“I have ruled yesterday that when a member is speaking, closure can be applied for. Therefore Mr. Kesava Pillai is quite in order. (After a pause) The question is that the question be now put.”

(Voices from the Swarajist bench: ‘It has not been seconded.’)

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“The question is that the question be now put”

The motion was put and carried.

A poll was demanded.

When the poll was being taken Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA rose up and said: “Mr. President, on a point of order, is it open to the Whip of a party to compel a member to vote?”

(Voices from both sides of the House: ‘Who was compelled?’)

Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA :—“Mr. Siva Raj.”

Mr. N. SIVA RAJ :—“No.”

The House divided as follows :—

Ayes.

- | | |
|---|------------------------------------|
| 1. The hon. Sir Norman Marjoribanks. | 10. Mr. F. E. Evans. |
| 2. ,,, Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur. | 11. ,,, H. A. Watson. |
| 3. ,,, Mr. T. E. Moir. | 12. ,,, G. T. Boag. |
| 4. ,,, Mr. A. Y.G. Campbell. | 13. ,,, A. McG. C. Tamppo. |
| 5. ,,, Mr. M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar. | 14. ,,, S. H. Slater. |
| 6. ,,, Mr. S. Muthiah Mudaliyar. | 15. ,,, C. B. Cotterell. |
| 7. ,,, Dr. P. Subbarayan. | 16. ,,, P. J. Gnanavararam Pillai. |
| 8. Diwan Bahadur P. Kesava Pillai. | 17. ,,, R. Foulkes. |
| 9. Rao Bahadur C. V. Anantakrishna Ayyar. | 18. Abdul Wahab Sahib Bahadur. |
| | 19. Mr. C. D. Appavu Chettiyar. |

29th March 1928]

Ayes—cont.

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 20. Mr. A. B. Shetty. | 30. Mr. V. I. Muniswami Pillai. |
| 21. " J. Bheemayya. | 31. " W. P. A. Soundarapandia Nadar. |
| 22. " V. Ch. John. | 32. " M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar. |
| 23. Mahmud Schannad Sahib Bahadur. | 33. Sir James Simpson. |
| 24. Mr. Muppil Nayar of Kavalappara. | 34. Mr. C. R. T. Congreve. |
| 25. Subadar-Major Nanjappa Bahadur. | 35. Rajkumar S. N. Dorai Raja. |
| 26. Mr. T. M. Narayanaswami Pillai. | 36. Mr. K. Ranachandra Padayachi. |
| 27. " N. Siva Raj. | 37. " G. R. Premayya. |
| 28. " M. V. Gangadhara Siva. | 38. Rao Sahib L. C. Guruswami. |
| 29. Rao Sahib L. C. Guruswami. | 39. Mr. V. Pamjee Rao. |

Noes.

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| 1. Mr. J. A. Saldanha. | 14. Dr. B. S. Mallayya. |
| 2. " Sami Venkatachalam Chetti. | 15. Mr. M. Narayana Rao. |
| 3. " S. Satyamorti. | 16. " C. Ramasomayajulu. |
| 4. " C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar. | 17. Basheer Ahmad Sayeed Sahib Bahadur. |
| 5. " T. Adinarayana Chettiyar. | 18. Mr. P. Bhaktavatslu Nayudu. |
| 6. " P. Anjaneyulu. | 19. Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayyo. |
| 7. " C. S. Govindaraja Mudaliyar. | 20. Mr. A. Kaleswara Rao. |
| 8. " G. Harisarvottama Rao. | 21. " K. Koti Reddi. |
| 9. " C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliyar. | 22. " K. V. Krishnaswami Nayakar. |
| 10. Abdul Hamid Khan Sahib Bahadur. | 23. The Raja of Ramnad. |
| 11. Mr. K. V. R. Swami. | 24. Mr. R. Nagan Gowda. |
| 12. Muhammad Meera Ravuttar Bahadur. | 25. " C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar. |
| 13. Mr. D. Narayana Raju. | |

Ayes 39. Noes 25.

The motion was carried.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The question is to reduce the allotment of Rs. 28,200 for the purchase of a house as residence for the District and Sessions Judge, Masulipatam, by Rs. 100."

The cut motion was put to vote and declared lost.

A poll was demanded and the House divided thus:—

Ayes.

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| 1. Mr. J. A. Saldanha. | 12. Muhammad Meera Ravuttar Bahadur. |
| 2. " Sami Venkatachalam Chetti. | 13. Mr. D. Narayana Raju. |
| 3. " S. Satyamorti. | 14. " M. Narayana Rao. |
| 4. " C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar. | 15. " C. Ramasomayajulu. |
| 5. " T. Adinarayana Chettiyar. | 16. Basheer Ahmad Sayeed Sahib Bahadur. |
| 6. " P. Anjaneyulu. | 17. Mr. P. Bhaktavatslu Nayudu. |
| 7. " C. S. Govindaraja Mudaliyar. | 18. Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayyo. |
| 8. " G. Harisarvottama Rao. | 19. Mr. A. Kaleswara Rao. |
| 9. " C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliyar. | 20. " K. Koti Reddi. |
| 10. Abdul Hamid Khan Sahib Bahadur. | 21. " K. V. Krishnaswami Nayakar. |
| 11. Mr. K. V. R. Swami. | |

Noes.

- | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|
| 1. The hon. Sir Norman Marjoribanks. | 16. Mr. P. J. Gnanavarman Pillai. |
| 2. " Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur. | 17. " R. Fonjkes. |
| 3. " Mr. T. E. Moir. | 18. Abdul Wahab Sahib Bahadur. |
| 4. " Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell. | 19. Mr. C. D. Appavu Chettiyar. |
| 5. " Mr. M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar. | 20. Sir James Simpson. |
| 6. " Mr. S. Muthiah Mudaliyar. | 21. Mr. A. B. Shetty. |
| 7. " Dr. P. Subbarayan. | 22. " J. Bheemayya. |
| 8. Diwan Bahadur P. Karava Pillai. | 23. " V. Ch. John. |
| 9. Rao Bahadur C. V. Anantakrishna Ayyar. | 24. Mahmud Schannad Sahib Bahadur. |
| 10. Mr. F. B. Evans. | 25. Mr. Muppil Nayar of Kavalappara. |
| 11. " H. A. Watson. | 26. Subadar-Major Nanjappa Bahadur. |
| 12. " G. T. Boag. | 27. Mr. T. M. Narayanaswami Pillai. |
| 13. " A. McG. C. Tamroe. | 28. " N. Siva Raj. |
| 14. " S. H. Slater. | 29. " M. V. Gangadhara Siva. |
| 15. " C. B. Cotterell. | 30. Rao Sahib L. C. Guruswami. |
| | 31. Mr. V. I. Muniswami Pillai. |
| | 32. " W. P. A. Soundarapandia Nadar. |

[29th March 1928]

Noes—cont.

- | | |
|---------------------------------|--|
| 33. Mr. C. R. T. Congreve. | 42. Mr. B. Ramachandra Reddi. |
| 34. Rajkumar S. N. Dorai Raja. | 43. The Raja of Panagal. |
| 35. Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udayar. | 44. Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. Patro. |
| 36. " G. R. Premayya. | 45. Diwan Babadur M. Krishnan Nayyar. |
| 37. Rao Sahib R. Srinivasan. | 46. Diwan Babadur P. C. Ethirajulu Nayudu. |
| 38. Mr. V. Ramjee Rao. | 47. Mr. T. K. Chidambaranatha Mudaliyar. |
| 39. The Raja of Ramnad. | 48. Rao Bahadur S. Pillappa Chettiar. |
| 40. Mr. R. Nagan Gowda. | 49. Kadir Mohitin Sahib Bahadur. |
| 41. The Zamindar of Gollapalli. | 50. T. M. Moidu Sahib Bahadur. |

Ayes 21. Noes 50.

The motion was lost.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I shall now put the closure motion for further demand to vote and if it is carried the demand will be put to vote."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—" May I make a statement ? "

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I shall now put the closure motion to vote and if it is carried I shall put the demand to vote and I have been applying this principle since yesterday. After that you can make the statement.

1 p.m.

" The question is that the demand be now put to the vote of the House."

The question was put to the House and declared carried.

A poll was demanded and the House divided thus :

Ayes.

- | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|
| 1. The hon. Sir Norman Marjoribanks. | 21. Mr. V. Ch. John. |
| 2. " Khan Bahadur Muhammed Usman Sahib Bahadur. | 22. Mahmud Schomad Sahib Bahadur. |
| 3. " Mr. T. E. Moir. | 23. Mr. Muppil Nayyer of Kavalappara. |
| 4. " Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell. | 24. Subadar Major Nanjappa Bahadur. |
| 5. " Mr. M. R. Setaratnam Ayyar. | 25. Mr. T. M. Narayana-wami Pillai. |
| 6. " Mr. S. Muthiah Mudaliyar. | 26. " N. Siva Raj. |
| 7. " Dr. P. Subbarayan. | 27. " M. V. Gangadhara Siva. |
| 8. Diwan Bahadur P. Kesava Pillai. | 28. Rao Sahib L. C. Guruswami. |
| 9. Rao Bahadur C. V. Anantakrishna Ayyar. | 29. Mr. V. I. Muniswami Pillai. |
| 10. Mr. F. B. Evans. | 30. " W. P. A. Soundarapandia Nadar. |
| 11. " G. T. Boag. | 31. " M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar. |
| 12. " A. McG. C. Tampos. | 32. " H. A. Watson. |
| 13. " S. H. Slater. | 33. Sir James Simpson. |
| 14. " C. B. Cotterell. | 34. Mr. C. R. T. Congreve. |
| 15. " P. J. Gnanavaram Pillai. | 35. Rajkumar S. N. Dorai Raja. |
| 16. " R. Foulkes. | 36. Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udayar. |
| 17. Abdul Wahab Sahib Bahadur. | 37. " K. Ramachandra Padayachi. |
| 18. Mr. C. D. Appava Chettiar. | 38. " G. R. Premayya. |
| 19. " A. B. Shetty. | 39. Rao Sahib R. Srinivasan. |
| 20. " J. Bheemayya. | 40. Mr. V. Ramjee Rao. |

Noes.

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| 1. Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti. | 14. Mr. M. Narayana Rao. |
| 2. " S. Satyamurti. | 15. " C. Ramasomayajulu. |
| 3. " C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar. | 16. Basheer Ahmad Sayeed Sahib Bahadur. |
| 4. " T. Adinarayana Chettiar. | 17. Mr. P. Bhaktavatsulu Nayudu. |
| 5. " P. Anjaneyulu. | 18. Sriwan Biswanath Das Mahasayo. |
| 6. " C. S. Govindaraja Mudaliyar. | 19. Mr. A. Kaleswara Rao. |
| 7. " G. Harisarvottama Rao. | 20. " Koti Reddi. |
| 8. " C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliyar. | 21. " K. V. Krishnaswami Nayakar. |
| 9. Abdul Hamid Khan Sahib Bahadur. | 22. The Raja of Ramnad. |
| 10. Mr. K. V. R. Swami. | 23. Mr. R. Nagan Gowda. |
| 11. Muhammad Meera Ravattar Bahadur. | 24. " C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar |
| 12. Mr. D. Narayana Raju. | 25. " J. A. Saldanha. |
| 13. Dr. B. S. Mallayya. | |

Ayes 40. Noes 25.

The closure motion was carried.

29th March 1928]

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ I now put the demand to the vote of the House.”

The demand was put to the House and declared carried.

A poll was demanded and the House divided thus :—

Ayes.

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. The hon. Sir Norman Marjoribanks. | 25. Subdar-Major Nanjappa Bahadur. |
| 2. ” Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur. | 26. Mr. N. Siva Raj. |
| 3. ” Mr. T. E. Moir. | 27. ” M. V. Gangadhara Siva. |
| 4. ” Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell. | 28. Rao Sahib L. C. Guruswami. |
| 5. ” Mr. M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar. | 29. Mr. V. I. Muniswami Pillai. |
| 6. ” Mr. S. Muthiah Mudaliyar. | 30. ” W. P. A. Soundarapandia Nadar. |
| 7. ” Dr. P. Subbarayan. | 31. ” M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar. |
| 8. Diwan Bahadur P. Kessava Pillai. | 32. Sir James Simpson. |
| 9. Rao Bahadur C. V. Anantakrishna Ayyar. | 33. Mr. C. R. T. Congreve. |
| 10. Mr. F. B. Evans. | 34. Rajkumar S. N. Dorai Raja. |
| 11. ” H. A. Watson. | 35. Mr. K. Ramachandra Padayachi. |
| 12. ” G. T. Bong. | 36. ” G. R. Premayya. |
| 13. ” A. McG. C. Tampose. | 37. Rao Sahib R. Srinivasan. |
| 14. ” S. H. Slater. | 38. The Raja of Ramnad. |
| 15. ” C. B. Cotterell. | 39. The Zamindar of Gollapalli. |
| 16. ” P. J. Gnanavararam Pillai. | 40. Mr. B. Ramachandra Reddi. |
| 17. ” R. Foulkes. | 41. The Raja of Panagal. |
| 18. Abdul Wahab Sahib Bahadur. | 42. Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. Patro. |
| 19. Mr. C. D. Appava Chettiyar. | 43. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar. |
| 20. ” A. B. Shetty. | 44. P. C. Ethirajulu Nayudu. |
| 21. ” J. Bheemayya. | 45. Mr. T. K. Chidambaranatha Mudaliyar. |
| 22. ” V. Ch. John. | 46. Rao Bahadur S. Ellappa Chettiyar. |
| 23. Mahmud Schamnad Sahib Bahadur. | 47. Khadir Mohideen Sahib Bahadur. |
| 24. Mr. Mappil Nayar of Kavalappara. | 48. T. M. Moideen Sahib Bahadur. |
| | 49. Mr. T. M. Narayanaswami Pillai. |
| | 50. ” S. Arputdaswami Udayar. |

Noes.

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| 1. Mr. J. A. Saldanha. | 12. Muhammad Meera Ravuttar Bahadur. |
| 2. ” Sauni Venkatachalam Chetti. | 13. Mr. D. Narayana Raju. |
| 3. ” B. Satyamurti. | 14. Dr. B. S. Maitayya. |
| 4. ” C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar. | 15. Mr. M. Narayana Rao. |
| 5. ” T. Adinarayana Chettiyar. | 16. ” O. Ramasomayajulu. |
| 6. ” P. Ajanayulu. | 17. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed Sahib Bahadur. |
| 7. ” C. S. Govindaraja Mudaliyar. | 18. Mr. P. Bhaktavatsulu Nayudu. |
| 8. ” G. Harisarvothma Rao. | 19. Sriyan Biswamata Das Mahasayo. |
| 9. ” C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliyar. | 20. Mr. A. Kaleswara Rao. |
| 10. Abdul Hamid Khan Sahib Bahadur. | 21. ” K. Koti Reddi. |
| 11. Mr. K. V. R. Swami. | 22. ” K. V. Krishnaswami Nayakar. |

Ayes 50. *Noes* 22.

The demand was carried and the grant made.

* The hon. Mr. M. R. SETURATNAM AYYAR :—“ On the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor I move

‘that Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 14,400 under Demand XXX—Civil Works—Transferred for the construction of an association ward in the Borstal School, Tanjore.’

“ Sir, the Borstal School at Tanjore was constituted as a Borstal School under the Act from 1st March 1927. The accommodation is not sufficient,

[29th March 1928]

* Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“ May I now move that the question be put ? ”

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ I second it.”

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ The motion has not yet been made.”

* Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“ He has finished making a speech.”

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ Let the speech be finished.”

* Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“ I thought, Sir, that the closure can be moved when the motion has been made.”

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ I said that the motion has not been made.”

* Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“ I simply want to know whether a closure motion cannot be made in the middle of a speech and before the speech is over.”

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ Cannot be made.”

* The hon. Mr. M. R. SETURATNAM AYYAR :—“ The accommodation is not sufficient and in order to provide sufficient accommodation for the same, I move this grant.”

* Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“ I now move for closure, Sir.”

The closure motion was put to the House and carried.

The demand was then put to the House and carried; and the grant was made.

* The hon. Mr. M. R. SETURATNAM AYYAR :—“ Sir, on the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor I move

“ that Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 17,200 under Demand XXX—Civil Works—Transferred—for repairs and improvements to the Hospital attached to the School of Indian Medicine.”

“ Sir, the Chief Engineer reports that the buildings require some urgent repairs and improvements. The repairs are very urgent and hence this grant is asked for.”

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ The hon. Member, Mr. Anjaneyulu, has given notice of a motion for the reduction of this grant in order to urge the necessity for the opening of a hostel. I want to know how this is in order.”

* Mr. P. ANJANEYULU :—“ I submit, Sir, that in my opinion the provision for a hostel is more necessary. The money that is now asked for is going to be spent on some improvements to the institution. I submit, Sir, that the improvement in the direction of provision of a hostel is more important than mere repairs. In that way, I submit that this motion is in order.”

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ I do not think the motion is in order; it may be an excellent ground for opposing this grant.”

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHEITI :—“ Sir, the plans and estimates are not placed before this House and we are unable to know in what direction the repairs and improvements are going to be effected. According to our view the amount should be set apart for improvements in the direction of the opening of a hostel.”

29th March 1928]

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ I have already given my ruling. It is too late.”

* Mr. ABDUL HAMID KHAN :—“ Sir, I oppose this motion in order to demonstrate to this House and to the public at large the scandalous way in which such buildings are purchased. This building was purchased only last year at a cost of Rs. 10,200 and within one year the Government have come before the House for a grant of Rs. 17,200 for repairs and improvements to this building. I should like to know, Sir, what portion of this amount is intended for repair and what portion for improvements. I know as a matter of fact that the building was a dilapidated one even when it was purchased. I know that the building was purchased and it was intended to satisfy political considerations of one person or another. The Government made a terrible mistake; it was a scandalous purchase. Even when it was made, Government ought to have known that it would require repairs even in a short time. I should like to know what portion of this amount is required for repairs and what portion for improvements.”

* Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo :—“ Mr. President, Sir, we had some discussion about the purchase of the building when that question came up before the House bitterly opposing the purchase and our opposition is justified. But that is past history. My present complaint is about the way in which indigenous system of medicine and the Indian School of Medicine are being treated. An old rotten building was purchased in an out of the way place as if no other building was available. It is difficult for the patients to go there and to get treatment which they love. When I call the building rotten, I do so deliberately. I am glad now that the Government have come forward with a demand for repairs to that building. I wholeheartedly join with Mr. Abdul Hamid Khan in all that he has said. This building is intended to accommodate the classes of the school of Indian Medicine, and the in-patients and out-patients of the hospital attached to it. I would invite hon. Members of the House to visit this institution which is to provide accommodation for three systems of medicine, namely, Siddha, Unani and Ayurvedic systems of medicine, which though allied to each other have certain special features to be developed separately by each one of them.

“ Sir, it pained me very much to see that the classes are held in sheds or under the trees, classes not ordinary but with more than 50 students in each. That is a sight for Gods to see and certainly for the hon. Minister! I would beg of him, I would implore him, to bestow more attention than he or his predecessors have done. I know that he himself was very anxious to do what little he could do, when he was an ordinary Member like myself, to the Indian School of Medicine. I now implore him to pay more attention and to translate that sympathy into action so as to make this new but excellent institution useful to the public. It was a great pleasure for me to see that people from various parts of Madras come for treatment under the Indian system of medicine at very great sacrifice in some cases paying tram or bus fares of $1\frac{1}{2}$ to $2\frac{1}{2}$ annas for each trip. That shows the utility, the efficacy and the popularity of the system. I am very sorry that such a system has been given step-motherly treatment up to this date. Even the beds are not sufficient to cover the needs of the patients. The Principal of the Indian School of Medicine who is very kind to these unfortunate patients that go there has to accommodate them in the verandahs for want of beds. I do not think the hon. Minister for Public Health or the House itself would

[Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo] [29th March 1928]

allow such a state of things to continue any longer. The hon. Mr. Usman Sahib, whom we are glad to see in the Treasury Bench now, was the chairman of the committee which submitted a report in 1923 and the Indian School of Medicine was started in 1924. He spent a considerable portion of his report advocating the necessity of having a separate system of registration with a separate Board.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ I am afraid the hon. Member has travelled far off.”

* Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo :—“ I know. (Laughter.) I shall show how this matter is relevant. Accommodation should be provided also for this Board in a building properly equipped and properly constructed in the same compound, for the compound is already quite extensive. It is therefore necessary to allot more funds and to constitute a separate Board. I associate myself with all that has been said. I am very sorry that proper attention has not been paid to this very important institution. Unless a satisfactory answer is forthcoming, with regard to building extensions for classes, out-and in-patient wards and Medical Board the only attitude we can have is one of negation and to oppose the grant instead of passing this grant which would merely be adding insult to injury.”

* Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA :—“ I quite agree, Sir, with the remarks made by my hon. Friend from Ganjam. The Government made a mistake in buying that building which is quite out of the way. There is no necessity for a hospital there, absolutely no necessity. The only recommendation for the building was that it served as a private nursing home for the officers of the Indian Medical Service. The next qualification is that the Raja of Panagal was residing there for some time. In all other respects it is a serious handicap. Students have been bitterly complaining that they find it difficult to get residential quarters round about the hospital and that they have considerable difficulty in reaching that place. During rains the compound is said to be marshy. As it is at present, the building is cracking. There is no room at all to teach 450 students, divided into six or seven sections, each section being in charge of one Professor. Sir, I was told that human bodies were dissected under trees and in sheds and that more dissections were carried on by crows and the remnants by jackals at night.

“ They wanted to open a maternity section to which I referred last year. They had no room at all and they had to rent a building in the next compound for about Rs. 150 or 200 per mensem. The building is already costing us a lakh and odd rupees. You are going to spend on that tottering building another Rs. 17,000. Even after spending a sum of Rs. 17,000, is it going to satisfy the growing demand of that rising institution? Is that desirable locality? Sir, we want urgently a building somewhere in Choolai for the Indian School of Medicine. I am told that the Military Department have a spacious compound and buildings there, the old pensioners' hospital. If the Government are keen on expanding this institution on up-to-date lines, one can easily acquire the site, and have spacious compound and accommodation for hospital and everything connected with it for the Indian School of Medicine. It is wasting money to repair that tottering building. Already a large amount has been wasted. The best course for the Government will be to sell that site at once and to go in for up-to-date buildings in Choolai. That is the quarter that requires the Indian hospital and not the

29th March 1918]

[Dr. B. S. Mallayya]

Poonamallee road. That is fashionable road. It is disadvantageous not only to students but also to patients who find it difficult to go that long distance. You can only help the bus-owners and not the poor patients by locating the hospital there."

* Mr. P. BHAKTAVATSULU NAYUDU :—“Sir, if the Government can be charged of playing ducks and drakes with public money, this is a very right instance. The explanatory note says that the Superintending Engineer reports that the building requires urgent repairs and improvements. I wish to know where this Superintending Engineer had gone in the year 1927, when this building was purchased. A tottering building in a forlorn corner has been purchased for a lakh and odd rupees. It is throwing public money in the Bay of Bengal. Here is an instance where the Government are playing with public money. People are starving, dying and asking for bread. Here is an instance where the Government have given stone for bread. A little while ago we voted for Rs. 28,000. Here is an Indian School of Medicine only formally and nominal. It is simply an eyewash to Indians that this institution has come into existence. What was the urgent necessity to go in for such a dilapidated building as if no other building was available in some central or useful centre and in a locality where the poor people can really have easy access to it. As my hon. Friend Dr. Mallayya pointed out, any amount of space is available in Perambur Barracks belonging to the Military Department which can be had by the Government merely by transferring it from paper to paper from the Military to the Civil Department. While such is the case, they bought a building in 1927 and they want to spend Rs. 17,000 and odd in the following year; they say that it is very urgent. As has been already pointed out, not only the patients find it difficult to go there, but students also are complaining that they cannot find place there to live close by. Why not the Government think of building hostel for pupils to live in? They have no money to do that; they have got money to provide quarters for District and Sessions Judges and other high officials if they are Europeans. The Chief Engineer reports that the building requires immediate attention and that the repairs cannot be postponed till 1929-30. I cannot understand why this benign and benevolent Government should go in for a building that cannot stand for two years. The Chief Engineer is very courageous in saying that the building can stand for one year. Is it not criminal folly on the part of the Government to purchase for one lakh and odd rupees a building which cannot stand for two years? Here is expert opinion. The Chief Engineer says that the building cannot stand till 1929-30 unless urgent repairs are carried out. What guarantee is there that this sum of Rs. 17,000 is going to be adequate? We will not be surprised if the Government come forward to this very House in the August session perhaps for another additional or supplementary grant for the same Indian School of Medicine through some other Minister perhaps, backed up by some other party.

“There is another anomaly in this matter. No provision has been made in the Civil Budget Estimate for the current year to meet the cost of repairing this building. Why, I ask, no provision was made in the Budget Estimate for the year 1928-29? Were not the Government aware of the dilapidated condition of that building? Why did not the Chief Engineer give intimation early enough to include this amount either in the Budget for 1927-28 or for 1928-29? We are now in the midst of the Budget for 1928-29. We

[Mr. P. Bhaktavatsulu Nayudu] [29th March 1928]

are now asked to give so many thousand rupees as a further demand. I cannot understand how these things are in order and how the Ministry can ask money like this without any responsibility about them. What is the Finance Department doing with such a strong Finance Member as the hon. Mr. Moir as its head? The explanatory note says: 'It is proposed to obtain the necessary funds by moving this demand.' The explanatory note is self-contradictory by itself. I oppose the motion on the ground that the building should be once for all abandoned and that a building in the centre of the city should be acquired."

Mr. T. M. NARAYANASWAMI PILLAI:—"I move, Sir, that the question be put."

Mr. N. SIVA RAJ:—"I second it."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The question is that the question be now put."

The motion was put to the House and declared lost.

A poll was demanded and the House divided thus:—

Ayes.

1-30 p.m.	1. The hon. Sir Norman Marjoribanks. 2. " Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur. 3. " Mr. T. E. Moir. 4. " Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell. 5. " Mr. M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar. 6. " Mr. S. Muthiah Mudaliyar. 7. " Dr. P. Subbarayan. 8. Diwan Bahadur P. Kesava Pillai. 9. Rao Bahadur C. V. Anantakrishna Ayyar. 10. Mr. H. A. Watson. 11. " G. T. Boag. 12. " A. McG. C. Tampe. 13. " S. H. Slater. 14. " C. B. Cotterell. 15. " P. J. Gnanavaram Pillai. 16. " R. Foulkes. 17. " C. D. Appavu Chettiar.	18. Mr. J. Bheemayya. 19. " V. Ch. John. 20. Mahmud Sohamud Sahib Bahadur. 21. Mr. Muppil Nayar of Kavalappara. 22. Subadar-Major Nanjappa Bahadur. 23. Mr. T. M. Narayanaswami Pillai. 24. " W. P. A. Soundarapandia Natar. 25. " M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar. 26. Sir James Simpson. 27. Rajkumar S. N. Dorai Raja. 28. Mr. S. Arputdaswami Udayar. 29. " K. Ramaiah Padayachi. 30. " G. R. Premayya. 31. Rao Sahib R. Srinivasan. 32. Mr. N. Siva Raj. 33. " M. V. Gangadhara Siva. 34. Rao Sahib L. C. Guruswami. 35. Mr. V. I. Muniswami Pillai.
--------------	---	--

Noes.

1. Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti. 2. " S. Satyanurti. 3. " C. V. Venkataraman Ayyangar. 4. " T. Adinarayana Chettiar. 5. " P. Anjaneyulu. 6. " C. S. Govindaraja Mudaliyar. 7. " G. Harisarvottama Rao. 8. " C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliyar. 9. Abdul Hamid Khan Sahib Bahadur. 10. Mr. K. V. R. Swami. 11. Muhammad Meera Kvottar Bahadur. 12. Mr. D. Narayana Raju. 13. Dr. B. S. Mallayya. 14. Mr. M. Narayana Rao.	15. Mr. O. Ramasomayajulu. 16. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed Sahib Bahadur. 17. Mr. P. Bhaktavatsulu Nayudu. 18. Friman Biswanath Das Mahasayo. 19. Mr. A. Kaleswara Rao. 20. " K. Koti Reddi. 21. " K. V. Krishnaswami Nayakar. 22. " C. Venkatarangam Nayudu. 23. Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar. 24. The Raja of Ramnad. 25. Mr. R. Nagan Gowda. 26. " C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar. 27. " J. A. Saldanha.
---	---

Ayes 35. *Noes* 27.

The closure motion was carried.

The demand was then put to the House and declared lost.

29th March 1928]

A poll was demanded and the House divided thus:—

Ayes.

1. The hon. Sir Norman Marjoribanks.
2. " Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur.
3. " Mr. T. E. Moir.
4. " Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell.
5. " Mr. M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar.
6. " Mr. S. Muthiah Mudaliyar.
7. " Dr. P. Subbarayam.
8. Diwan Bahadur P. Keeava Pillai.
9. Rao Bahadur C. V. Anantakrishna Ayyar.
10. Mr. H. A. Watson.
11. " G. T. Boag.
12. " A. McG. C. Tamboo.
13. " S. H. Slater.
14. " C. B. Cotterell.
15. " P. J. Guhanayaram Pillai.
16. " R. Foulkes.
17. " G. D. Appiva Chettiar.
18. " J. Bheemayya.
19. " V. Ch. John.
20. Mahmud Nehmannal Sahib Bahadur.
21. Mr. Muppil Nayar of Kavallappara.
22. Subadar-Major S. A. Nanjappa Bahadur.
23. Mr. T. M. Narayanaswami Pillai.
24. Mr. N. Siva Raj.
25. " M. V. Gangadharra Siva
26. Rao Sahib L. C. Guruswami.
27. Mr. V. I. Muniswami Pillai.
28. " W. P. A. Soundarapandia Nadar.
29. " M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar.
30. Sir James Simpson.
31. Rajkumar S. N. Dorai Raja.
32. Mr. G. R. Prarayya.
33. Rao Sahib R. Srinivasan.
34. Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar.
35. The Raja of Ramnud.
36. Mr. R. Nagin Gowda.
37. The Zamindar of Seithur.
38. Mr. C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar.
39. The Zamindar of Gollapalli.
40. Mr. B. Ramaohandra Reddi.
41. The Raja of Paragal.
42. Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. Patro.
43. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar.
44. " P. C. Ethirajulu Nayudu.
45. Rao Bahadur S. Ellappa Chettiar.
46. Abdul Razack Sahib Bahadur.
47. Khadir Mohidin Sahib Bahadur.

Noes.

1. Mr. J. A. Saldanha.
2. " Sami Venkatachalam Chetti.
3. " S. Satyamurti.
4. " C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar.
5. " T. Adinarayana Chettiar.
6. " P. Anjaneyulu.
7. " O. S. Govindaraja Mudaliyar.
8. " G. Harisarvothama Rao.
9. " C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliyar.
10. Abdul Hamid Khan Sahib Bahadur.
11. Mr. K. V. R. Swami.
12. Muhammad Meera Ravinther Bahadur.
13. Mr. D. Narayana Raju.
14. " M. Narayana Rao.
15. " C. Ramasomayajulu.
16. Basheer Ahmad Sayeed Sahib Bahadur.
17. Mr. P. Bhaktivatsalu Nayudu.
18. Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo.
19. Mr. A. Kaleswara Rao.
20. " K. Koti Reddi.
21. " K. V. Krishnaswami Nayakar.
22. " C. Venkatarangam Nayudu.

Ayes 47. Noes 22.

The motion was carried and the grant made.

* Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—" I beg to move for the adjournment of the consideration of the other grants to the next meetings."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The hon. Member will resume his seat. I will give him a chance immediately after the Council meets after lunch. The Council will now adjourn and meet at 2-30."

After Lunch (2-30 p.m.).

* Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—" Sir, I beg to move

'that the discussion on the further demands for grants that still remain to be disposed of be adjourned to the next sitting of the House.'

" I have three reasons for it. The first is that twelve Members of this Council have to attend the meeting of the Senate of the University at 3 o'clock to-day. We being representatives of this House in the Senate which is the centre of the intellectual life of this Presidency, it is highly desirable that we must be allowed to go there. At the same time we should be doing injustice to ourselves and this House in absenting ourselves from the House. Secondly, we are feeling much fagged by the exhaustive discussion we have

[Mr. J. A. Saldanha]

[29th March 1928]

had these days sitting late in the evening, and I think we must rest on our oars to prepare ourselves for to-morrow's work. Thirdly, Sir, it is an important Hindu holiday to-day (Sri Ramanavami), and I find also the courts have closed to-day. So I think it proper that for these reasons the consideration of the remaining demands should be adjourned. There is no urgency for them at all, and they may come as supplementary demands later on."

* Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"I have great pleasure in seconding this—only there is a touch of personality in it. This day is declared a holiday for the Vaishnavites, and I do not think Vaishnavites can be compelled to attend the Council, nor can they be deprived of the benefit of attending the Council. As there are a number of Vaishnavites here and as Government has declared this a holiday for Vaishnavites, I hope, in the interests of individual and communal liberties, the House will accept this motion at least at this stage of the day."

* The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS:—"Mr. President, Sir, the objection to the sitting to-day on the ground it is a holiday should have been taken earlier. As for the other reasons I have only this to say that the business of this House is second to none."

The adjournment motion was put and declared carried.

A poll was demanded and the House divided as follows :—

Ayes.

- | | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 1. Mr. J. A. Saldanha. | 10. Dr. B. S. Mallayya. |
| 2. " Sami Venkatachalam Chetti. | 11. Mr. M. Narayana Rao. |
| 3. " S. Satyamurti. | 12. " C. Raunasmayajulu. |
| 4. " Venkataranama Ayyangar. | 13. Basir Ahmad Sayeed Sahib Bahadur. |
| 5. " P. Anjaneyulu. | 14. Mr. A. Kaleswara Rao. |
| 6. " C. S. Govindaraja Mudaliar. | 15. " K. Koti Reddi. |
| 7. " G. Harisarvottama Rao. | 16. " K. V. Krishnaswami Nayakar. |
| 8. " K. V. R. Swami. | 17. " C. Venkatarangam Nayudu. |
| 9. " D. Narayana Raja. | |

Noes.

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. The hon. Sir Norman Marjoribanks. | 21. Mr. T. M. Narayanaswami Pillai. |
| 2. " Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur. | 25. " V. I. Muniswami Pillai. |
| 3. " Mr. T. E. Moir. | 26. " W. P. A. Soundarapandia Nadar. |
| 4. " Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell. | 27. " M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar. |
| 5. " Dr. P. Subbarayan. | 28. Rajkumar S. N. Dorai Raja. |
| 6. " Mr. S. Muthiah Mudaliar. | 29. Mr. S. Arputdaswami Udayar. |
| 7. " Mr. M. R. Suturtnam Ayyar. | 30. The Zamindar of Kallikota. |
| 8. Diwan Bahadur P. Kesava Pillai. | 31. Mr. G. R. Premayya. |
| 9. Rao Bahadur C. V. Anantakrishna Ayar. | 32. Swami A. S. Sahajanandam. |
| 10. Mr. F. B. Evans. | 33. Rao Sahib R. Srinivasan. |
| 11. " H. A. Watson. | 34. Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliar. |
| 12. " G. T. Boag. | 35. Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Medaliyar. |
| 13. " A. McG. C. Tamboo. | 36. Mr. R. Nagan Gowda. |
| 14. " S. H. Slater. | 37. " C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar. |
| 15. " C. B. Cottrell. | 38. " C. Gopala Menon. |
| 16. " P. J. Gnauvararam Pillai. | 39. " B. Ramachandra Reddi. |
| 17. " R. Foulkes. | 40. The Raja of Panagal. |
| 18. " C. D. Appu Chettiyar. | 41. Rao Bahadur Sir A. R. Patro. |
| 19. " J. Bhreemaya. | 42. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar. |
| 20. " V. Ch. John. | 43. " P. C. Ethirajulu Nayudu. |
| 21. Mahmud Schamnad Sahib Bahadur. | 44. Rao Bahadur S. Ellappa Chettiyar. |
| 22. Subadar-Major S. A. Nanjippa Bahadur. | 45. Abdul Raazak Sahib Bahadur. |
| 23. Rao Bahadur O. M. Narayanan Nambudri-pad. | 46. Kadir Michidin Sahib Bahadur. |
| | 47. T. M. Moidoo Sahib Bahadur. |

Ayes 17. Noes 47.

The motion was negatived.

29th March 1928]

* The hon. Mr. M. R. SETURATNAM AYYAR :—“ On the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor, I beg to move

‘that the Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,00,200 under Demand XXX—Civil Works—Transferred for the construction of a Natural Science Block in the Presidency College, Madras.’

“ Sir, additional accommodation has been provided for certain subjects, such as History, Physics and Chemistry, but the need for Geology has not been attended to still. The necessity for increased accommodation is keenly felt, and hence the demand for further grant.”

Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO :—“ I oppose this motion, Sir, for a further demand of Rs. 1,00,200 for the construction of a Natural Science Block in the Presidency College. I do not see any reason why the Government should come forward with this demand at this stage. I want to know from the hon. the Minister in charge what the Government were doing at the time of the budget, and why a further demand has become necessary. Besides the amount is a large one. It is stated in the explanatory note, ‘the Committee desired to have full information as to the future liabilities which are likely to be incurred on the scientific subjects while they regarded with some anxiety the large expenditure to which they are giving rise.’ That is what is stated in the note. I wish to know, Sir, what full information the Government has got at its disposal for coming forward with this grant? The Andhra University, Sir, has received very scant consideration at the hands of the Government. The Colleges in the mufassal, particularly the Government Colleges in the Andhra districts, have not been treated properly and nothing has been spent for the buildings of the Andhra University. I would on that account also oppose the motion for spending further large sums in the Presidency city on collegiate education.”

* Mr. C. RAMASOMAYAJULU :—“ Sir, if I oppose this motion, it is not because I am against the idea of necessary constructions being made for the Natural Science Block, but it is on the principle that this amount should have been foreseen by Government before the budget time, as is evident from the explanatory note. The note is very clear in the matter. The necessity for this has been seen long long ago. Further, I expected that the Minister would say, in addition to what is stated in the note, what has taken place since with reference to the last sentence of the note. There is no enlightenment on the matter at all. But this particular time is taken advantage of to bring this demand. The House will have seen by this time that large sums of money are thrust upon us in this out-of-the-way manner. This we object to. It is incumbent on the Government to justify the necessity in the case of each of the several grants that are now put before the House by giving the full facts. It is on these grounds that I beg to oppose the motion.”

* Mr. T. M. NARAYANASWAMI PILLAI :—“ I support the demand, Sir. 2-45 p.m. The hon. Member Mr. Kaleswara Rao opposed the demand because certain sums were not provided for the Andhra University. The speaker only cited reasons to convince the House of the unreasonableness of the demand because the Andhra University has not been provided with sums. On the other hand, the subsequent speaker came forward and he was just in putting forward the reasons. His whole reason related to the point of order, viz.,

[Mr. T. M. Narayanaswami Pillai] [29th March 1928]

that all these grants have not been foreshadowed and that they have not been provided already. Now that has been ruled out, I see the reasonableness of the demand has been accepted. It is for the construction of a geology block that this demand has been moved and I need not bring to the notice of the House the importance of such a subject as geology. This subject has been pending for the last 14 or 15 years, that is, since 1914. As the explanatory note suggests, the House is anxious to develop the possibilities of this country and has now come forward with a grant of this kind relating to geology. I therefore have great pleasure in supporting the demand and opposing the motion for cut."

* Mr. P. ANJANEYULU:—"I am sorry that the last speaker has adduced reasons more in favour of the objections raised by my hon. Friend from Kistna than against them. He says that for the last 20 years this subject has been pending before the Government, at least from 1914. That is exactly the reason why my hon. Friend from Kistna has stated that he was going to oppose this, because it was up to the Government to have included this item in the budget, if they were so minded. On the other hand, the last paragraph of the explanatory note says that reasonable doubts were raised by the Finance Committee and they expressed the hope that hereafter this Government would not come forward before the Finance Committee with such expenditure on such a large scale unless and until they would get more detailed information. The objection taken has not yet been answered. Though the Finance Committee is not provided with reasons, after the Finance Committee raised the subject, the hon. the Minister for Education has not been pleased to give any hint as to the reasons that necessitated the asking for this grant at this stage at least. We are not at all unwilling to give any reasonable amount that may be spent on the acquisition of knowledge in scientific field, and I as a Member of the Madras Senate cannot take any reasonable objection to any amount of money being spent on education, especially scientific education. Let it not be understood by any portion of this House that we are against this grant, but we are against the principle involved in the demand for this grant. This question is yet to be answered. When a similar demand was moved and a similar objection was raised the other day it was in part answered by the hon. the Finance Member that the matter was put before the Finance Committee, that the Finance Committee did not come to any decision in time for the budget and therefore it was up to the Government that they took the earliest possible opportunity of bringing that demand before the House. At least logic is satisfied to some extent. But so far as this particular scheme is concerned, this scheme has been before the Government for the last 20 years. The principle on which we base our objection is that it is not right for the Government to bring this demand in this fashion. Of course we know the result of this resolution. We are not for mere obstruction as my hon. Friend the Minister for Education seems to think, though this is a legitimate right of the Opposition. We are here to do our duty. We know that in doing our duty, we shall, time after time, be defeated by this physical numerical power overriding the just and spiritual forces of the Opposition; and yet our satisfaction is both to our own conscience and to the constituency outside. In that spirit and on this principle we oppose. We trust that hereafter at least the Government will give ample opportunities for the Opposition to place its views, whatever they may

29th March 1928]

[Mr. P. Anjaneyulu]

be, in a reasonable manner before this House, and that the Finance Member and the other Members of the Government may to the best of their ability try to satisfy the legitimate demands for the enquiry or information, which the Opposition has a right to get in this House, and it is to enunciate and to impress that principle on the Government that I support the motion for the cut."

* Mr. T. M. NARAYANASWAMI PILLAI :—“I move for closure, Sir.”

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“As the hon. Member has already spoken, he has no right to move for closure.”

Mr. C. GOPALA MENON :—“Sir, I wish to support this grant, but at the same time I wish to strike a note of warning, and I am justified in doing so, by the observation made by the Finance Committee. We do not know what the future commitments of this natural science block in the Presidency College is going to be. The Government has come forward asking for a grant of Rs. 1,00,200 and probably it might go up higher and therefore I would earnestly urge on the Minister to find out what the future commitments are going to be before we finally embark upon this project.”

Mr. M. A. MANIKKAVELU NAYAKAR :—“I move for closure, Sir.”

The closure motion was put to the House and declared carried.

Dr. B. S. Mallayya demanded a poll, and the House divided as follows :—

Ayes.

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. The hon. Sir Norman Marjoribanks. | 16. Mr. R. Foulkes. |
| 2. ,,, Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur. | 17. ,,, J. Bheesnayya. |
| 3. ,,, Mr. T. E. Moir. | 18. ,,, V. Ch. John. |
| 4. ,,, Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell. | 19. Subadar-Major Nanjappa Bahadur. |
| 5. ,,, Mr. M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar. | 20. Rao Bahadur O. M. Narayanan Namubripad. |
| 6. ,,, Mr. S. Muthiah Mudaliyar. | 21. Mr. T. M. Narayanaswami Pillai. |
| 7. ,,, Dr. P. Subbarayan. | 22. ,,, N. Siva Raj. |
| 8. Rao Bahadur C. V. Anantakrishna Ayyar. | 23. ,,, M. V. Gangadhara Siva. |
| 9. Mr. F. B. Evans. | 24. Rao Sahib L. C. Guruswami. |
| 10. ,,, H. A. Watson. | 25. Mr. W. P. A. Soandarapandia Nadar. |
| 11. ,,, G. T. Boag. | 26. ,,, S. Venkayya. |
| 12. ,,, A. McG. C. Tamboo. | 27. ,,, M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar. |
| 13. ,,, S. H. Slater. | 28. ,,, G. R. Premayya. |
| 14. ,,, C. B. Cotterell. | 29. Swami A. S. Sahajanandam. |
| 15. ,,, P. J. Gnanavararam Pillai. | 30. Rao Sahib R. Srinivasan. |

Noes.

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| 1. Mr. Sami Venkitachalam Chetti. | 8. Mr. K. V. R. Swami. |
| 2. ,,, T. Adinarayana Chettiar. | 9. ,,, D. Narayana Raju. |
| 3. ,,, P. Anjaneyulu. | 10. Dr. B. S. Mallayya. |
| 4. ,,, C. S. Govindaraja Mudaliyar. | 11. Mr. C. Ramasomayajulu. |
| 5. ,,, G. Harisavottama Rao. | 12. Basheer Ahmad Sayeed Sahib Bahadur. |
| 6. ,,, C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliyar. | 13. Mr. A. Kaleswara Rao. |
| 7. Abdul Hamid Khan Sahib Bahadur. | 14. ,,, K. V. Krishnaswami Nayakar. |

Ayes 30. Noes 14.

The closure motion was carried.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“I now put the demand to the vote of the House.”

The demand was put to the House and declared lost.

[29th March 1928]

The hon. Dr. P. Subbarayan demanded a poll, and the House divided as follows:—

Ayes.

1. The hon. Sir Norman Marjoribanks.
2. " Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur.
3. " Mr. T. E. Moir.
4. " Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell.
5. " Mr. M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar.
6. " Mr. S. Muthiah Mudaliyar.
7. " Dr. P. Subbarayan.
8. Rao Bahadur C. V. Anantakrishna Ayyar.
9. Mr. F. B. Evans.
10. " H. A. Watson.
11. " G. T. Bosq.
12. " A. McG. C. Tamgee.
13. " S. H. Slater.
14. " C. B. Cotterell.
15. " P. J. Gnanavaram Pillai.
16. " R. Foukles.
17. " J. Bheemayya.
18. " V. Ch. John.
19. Mahmud Schamnad Sahib Bahadur.
20. Subadar-Major Nanjappa Bahadur.
21. Rao Bahadur O. M. Narayanan Nambudri-pad.
22. Mr. T. M. Narayanaswami Pillai.
23. Mr. N. Siva Raj.
24. " M. V. Gangadhara Siva.
25. Rao Sabih L. C. Guruswami.
26. Mr. W. P. A. Soundara Pandia Nadar.
27. " S. Venkayya.
28. " M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar.
29. " C. H. T. Congreve.
30. " G. R. Preunayya.
31. Swami A. S. Sahajanandam.
32. Rao Sabih R. Srinivasan.
33. Mr. A. Ianganatha Mudaliyar.
34. Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar.
35. Mr. R. Nagan Gowda.
36. " C. R. Partheeswarthi Ayyangar.
37. " C. Gopala Menon
38. The Raja of Panagal.
39. Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. Patro.
40. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar.
41. " P. C. Ethirajulu Nayudu.
42. Rao Bahadur S. Ellappa Chettiyar.
43. Abdul Razack Sahib Bahadur.
44. Khadir Moideen Sahib Bahadur.

Noes.

1. Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti.
2. " T. Adinarayana Chettiyar.
3. " P. Anjaneyulu.
4. " C. S. Govindaraja Mudaliyar.
5. " G. Harisarvottama Rao.
6. " C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliyar.
7. Abdul Hamid Khan Sohib Bahadur.
8. Mr. K. V. R. Swami.
9. " D. Narayana Raju.
10. Dr. B. S. Mallayya.
11. Mr. C. Ramasomayajulu.
12. Basheer Ahmad Sayeed Sahib Bahadur.
13. Srikanth Biswanath Das Mahasayo.
14. Mr. A. Kaleswara Rao.
15. " K. Koti Reddi.
16. " K. V. Krishnaswami Nayakar.
17. " O. Venkataraman Nayudu.

Ayes 44. Noes 17.

The motion was carried and the grant was made.

* The hon. Mr. M. R. SETURATNAM AYYAR:—"Mr. President, Sir, on the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor, I move

'that Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,00,00 under Demand XXX—Civil Works—Transferred.'

"This is for the purchase of the old Medical Stores building for the location of the Government Training School for Masters. The Government Training School for Masters is now located in a portion of the old Medical Stores building, Mint street, Madras, on payment of rent for the same. (Dr. B. S. Mallayya: What rent please?) As no other suitable building is available for the location of the Training school, it is proposed to purchase this Military building for the purpose."

3 p.m. The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The question is that Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,00,000 under Demand XXX.—Civil Works—Transferred."

* Mr. P. ANJANEYULU:—"Mr. President, Sir, I oppose this motion very vehemently, for the reason that this is a demand for another building for the location of another school called the Government Training School. I fear that this purchase will be next to the other purchase, namely, the building for the Medical School. And the cost of the building is almost the same,

29th March 1928]

[Mr. P. Anjaneyulu]

i.e., one lakh of rupees, and the estimated cost according to the explanatory note is a little over one lakh of rupees. The Government of India very graciously are willing to part with it for one lakh! The money is to be given away to the Military authorities. We should like to know from the hon. the Minister who has asked for the amount, the rent that they are paying. He said that he will give out the amount of rent that they are paying monthly, but he has not yet given us and I do request him that he would be pleased to give us the figure."

The hon. Mr. M. R. SETURATNAM AYYAR :—“ It is Rs. 220.”

* Mr. P. ANJANEYULU :—“ Sir, they say in the note that no building is available. I submit that time after time we have been accusing this Government that they would spend large sums of money on brick and chunam and not on building the real brain power of the nation. This is yet another instance where one lakh of rupees is going to be spent on brick and chunam and possibly on a house old and dilapidated and they may come next year with another supplementary demand for another Rs. 75,000 for repairs and then say in another explanatory note ‘ These repairs are very urgently needed and the Chief Engineer says that otherwise the whole building will come down on the heads of the students and the teachers.’ On two grounds, Mr. President, I oppose this motion. First, that we do not want in this country to spend such large sums of money over buildings. If instead of going in for high designs and costly buildings and all that sort of thing, which only pays some money to the contractor and others giving contracts and so on, some of which could not be easily proved, instead of wasting this money in this manner, we devote some of it on repairs of tanks or village communications we shall really be serving the necessary needs of the country. We need not be housed as in Western countries against cold and the seasons. We may have open buildings not of the type designed but of a cheaper kind and we can accommodate training students much better and even have hostels and lodging and boarding houses. To please a certain department or a certain person or without much advertence to the amount spent, because a certain department or a certain influential person is coming forward they seem to think that they can find money to be practically wasted over buildings and not find money enough for people who are starving for their food, and who have not got water for their cattle. If we spend a little sum of money on these and such other small things, we can give great relief to the people. They are unwilling to spend anything in the districts and in the villages, because they say they have no funds. On these grounds, Sir, I do oppose this and I hope that the hon. Members of the House will sympathise with the real needs of the people who are mute to-day and are unable to give utterance to their grievances, but who will one day come down on us with such a force that we will find it difficult to resist them. We do not think of the starving people of the village who are not well fed or well clothed, whose cattle are in want of fodder, and even water sometimes, but their memories will haunt us when we are spending these lakhs and lakhs over buildings and the purchase of costly houses. For these reasons, Sir, I oppose this motion.”

* Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI :—“ Mr. President, I fully endorse all the statements made by my hon. Friend, Mr. Anjaneyulu. The one programme of the Ministerial party and the Ministers seems to be to spend as much money as possible on these buildings, and the purchase of a building where houses

[Mr. K. V. R. Swami]

[29th March 1928]

are available for rent for purposes like this. I say this is simply waste of money. Now, they are paying about Rs. 200 or Rs. 250 per month for this building as rent and the hon. the Minister just stated it is not possible to rent another building for this purpose. In a big city like Madras, where I am told the cost of buildings is going down every day and more buildings are available now for occupation than at any other time, that a building for this purpose is not available is really strange. What seems to be at the back of the thing is that the policy of the Ministerialist party now seems to be to own a building for any and every purpose. We wanted money for educational purposes and very urgently too, because boys are growing and girls are growing in ignorance and so much money was needed. At a time like this that we should try to attempt to have palatial buildings purchased at the cost of the ratepayer is anything but desirable. The persistent attempt that is being made by the Government to waste money like this would show that they do not care for the opinions generally held in this country. My hon. Friend, Sir A. P. Patro, while he was Minister was saying that money should not be wasted on these buildings and that the type designs formerly intended for the buildings were very costly and they would not suit the purposes for which they were intended. That seems to have been altogether given up by the present Ministry, though they are following the old Ministry in so many ways; with regard to economy in these matters they do not seem to have any regard even for the views of their own predecessors in office.

"I also oppose it because the cost of it is very high. It is something like forty times what they are paying now. A property like this would not fetch more than twenty times at any time, and it is not stated in what condition the building is at present. Very soon it may be found that the building would require ample repairs and we will have to spend more money on that. All that we want is some place for opening the training school for teachers. But it does not require a building of such huge cost. So in these circumstances we oppose this motion."

MR. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI.—"Mr. President, Sir, I rise to oppose this motion, not only for the reasons stated by my hon. Friends Mr. P. Anjaneyalu and Mr. Swami, but also for the additional reason that is contained in the explanatory note of the Minister himself. It is admitted that the Government Training School for Masters is kept in a building at a monthly rental of Rs. 250. Apparently the school occupies a small portion of the huge building. I have a hazy idea of the old Medical Stores building. The Government Training School can only occupy a portion of the building. Therefore, there is no meaning in acquiring a huge building like this. Moreover, I am also aware that the Government of India in the Military Department have been for some time past anxious to dispose of that building. In regard to the purchase, they have approached the Provincial Government and through the Provincial Government some local bodies. I should very much like to know indeed if the Transferred half is not made a dumping ground for the purchase of Government buildings and thereby increase the expenditure on the Transferred side, justifying that there was a larger expenditure on the Transferred side. I would like my hon. Friend, the Minister for Development, to examine this question thoroughly and see whether there is any necessity for such a huge building as this for the Government Training School: if it can be accommodated in a small portion on a monthly rent of Rs. 250 or so, I daresay that some other building can

29th March 1928] [Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti]

be easily got in that locality at that rent. There seems to be no necessity to spend such a large amount like one lakh of rupees which at 6 per cent must give Rs. 500 a month. That means that they are going in for a building, which is more than what you require for the purpose. Unless it be to satisfy the Government and the Military Department by purchasing the building, there seems to be no necessity for the demand made by the Government. I know, Sir, that the hon. the Minister is quite new to the subject, though he is trying to distinguish himself by frequent reference to the Swarajist party. I still have some respect for him and request him to examine the question properly before he rushes with the demand."

* Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA :—“Sir, I know this building and have known it for the last thirty years. There is no building anywhere near here that is so costly as that which is proposed to be bought from the Military authorities. The question to be considered is this: Are the Military authorities entitled to claim any money for it? It was originally the Local Government's property before it was handed over to the Military authorities, and when there was no more use to the Military for that ground, there is an implied understanding it seems that it must revert to the local Government. And this question is going to be decided very soon, I am told, in Delhi. There are a good lot of properties to be settled that way in Madras. Leaving that aside, Sir, I should like to know from the hon. the Third Minister who is familiar with this part of the Mint Street (laughter) whether buildings in this locality are worth that money. Suppose that building were to be sold to-day by public auction, will anybody buy it even for a fifth of the price which the Government are proposing to give for it? Sir, it is a building more than sixty years old and if we are going to use it for our schools we will have to overhaul it completely. We will have to spend more than two lakhs for that. After spending that amount, will that building still be fit for your occupation? Is that locality a healthy one for the location of a Government school? Sir, you are paying Rs. 250 as rent per month now. That comes to about Rs. 3,000 a year. But then, Sir, if you buy that building for a lakh of rupees from the Military authorities, and use it, is the hon. the Minister aware that he will have to pay the Corporation an annual tax of Rs. 6,000, while you are now spending only Rs. 2,500 or Rs. 3,000 in the shape of rent. But if you buy it, you will have to give the Corporation Rs. 6,000 annually in the shape of tax on house property at 6 per cent of the value of purchase. You will also have to spend money over it for repairs. Is it an advisable thing to purchase it at one lakh when you can use it easily at Rs. 2,500 rent annually? The Military authorities cannot force it on anybody else. They have no customers. No man in Madras will pay more than Rs. 20,000 or Rs. 18,000 for that building at present. Because the Local Government are convenient customers, they think they can take away the money from us. I have to call it a waste and an avoidable waste.”

* The hon. Dr P. SUBBARAYAN :—“Mr. President, Sir, my hon. Friend, the Leader of the Opposition, knows the place as well as I do, and I admit that only a part of the building is now being used for the location of the Training School. But the object with which this building is purchased is not only to locate the school, but also to . . .”

Mr. A. Kaleswara Rao rose in his seat.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“Is it a point of order?”

[29th March 1928]

Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO :—“ I now move that the question be now put.”
 ‘ The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ Not accepted.”

* The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—“ Secondly, Sir, we want to have a hostel for Adi-Dravida teachers who are attending the school. As a matter of fact, this is one of the schools which are really being maintained for training Adi-Dravida masters and the hostel is to be located in the building itself, and the portion which is not required for the school will be used as a hostel for these boys there.”

Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI :—“ How many of them are there ? ”

* The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—“ I think there are about 30 Adi-Dravidas.” (Laughter.)

Mr. C. S. GOVINDARAJA MUDALIYAR :—“ A magnificent number ! ”

3-15 p.m.
 * The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—“ You may call it magnificent, but things begin in a small way and grow big later on. Hon. Members of the Opposition profess sympathy for the Adi-Dravidas, but they show their sympathy by going out whenever anything relating to depressed classes comes up before this House . . . ”

Dr. B. S. MALLAIYA :—“ Put them in a healthier quarter.”

* The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—“ No doubt the price looks rather high at present, but the hon. Member need not be afraid that repairs will be necessary for that building, because the building is in a good condition and it will be in such a state that it may not be necessary to have any repairs for it for a long time to come.”

* Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—“ I want to raise only one point, Sir. The explanatory note says: ‘ The Committee recorded the opinion that in the allocation of the building the requirements of the Government Press should be given precedence.’ Apparently, the intention of the Government is to locate a portion of the Government Press there. If so, I do not see why the whole cost of the building should be put down to the Transferred departments.”

* The hon. Mr. T. E. Mois :—“ I think, Sir, I can answer the two points that were raised relating to the Finance Department. One question was put as to whether the Military department had a right to claim payment for this building that we wish to take over. That department is under the Government of India, and the Government of India and the Provincial Government are entirely independent in these matters. As we wish to buy this building, as long as the Government of India are in possession of it, we have to pay for it in exactly the same way as the Government of India would have to pay, in its turn, to the Government of Madras for any building or land belonging to the latter.

“ As regards the question put by my hon. Friend, Mr. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar, regarding the possible allocation of this building to meet the requirements of the Government Press, of course necessarily when that is decided upon, there will be a book transaction as between the Transferred and the Reserved departments concerned.”

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ I take it that the House is now ready for a vote.

29th March 1928]

[The President]

"The question is that the Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,00,000 under Demand XXX—Civil Works—Transferred."

The question was put to the House and declared lost.

A poll was demanded by the hon. Sir Norman Marjoribanks and the House divided thus:—

Ayes.

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. The hon. Sir Norman Marjoribanks. | 22. Mr. T. M. Narayanaswami Pillai. |
| 2. " Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur. | 23. " N. Siva Raj. |
| 3. " Mr. T. E. Moir. | 24. " M. V. Gangadhara Siva. |
| 4. " Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell. | 25. Rao Sahib L. C. Gureswami. |
| 5. " Dr. P. Subbarayan. | 26. Mr. W. P. A. Soundarapandia Nadar. |
| 6. " Mr. S. Muthiah Mudaliyar. | 27. " S. Venkaya. |
| 7. " Mr. M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar. | 28. " M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar. |
| 8. Rao Bahadur C. V. Anantakrishna Ayyar. | 29. " C. R. T. Congreve. |
| 9. Mr. F. B. Evans. | 30. The Zamindar of Kallikola. |
| 10. " H. A. Watson. | 31. Mr. G. R. Premaya. |
| 11. " G. T. Boag. | 32. Swami A. S. Sahajananda. |
| 12. " A. McG. C. Tamboo. | 33. Rao Sahib R. Srinivasan. |
| 13. " S. H. Slater. | 34. Syed Tajudin Sahib Bahadur. |
| 14. " C. B. Cotterell. | 35. Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar. |
| 15. " P. J. Gnanavaram Pillai. | 36. Mr. C. R. Parthaasrathi Ayyangar. |
| 16. " R. Foulkes. | 37. The Zamindar of Goilapalli. |
| 17. " J. Bheemaya. | 38. The Raja of Panagal. |
| 18. " V. Gh. John. | 39. Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. Patro. |
| 19. " Muppil Nayar of Kavalappara. | 40. " S. Ellappa Chettiar. |
| 20. Subadar-Major Nanjappa Bahadur. | 41. Abdul Razaack Sahib Bahadur. |
| 21. Rao Bahadur O. M. Narayanan Nambudri-pad. | 42. Khadir Muhibdeen Sahib Bahadur. |
| | 43. T. M. Moidu Sahib Bahadur. |

Noes.

- | | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| 1. Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti. | 7. Mr. C. Ramasomayajulu. |
| 2. " P. Anjaneyulu. | 8. " D. Narayana Raju. |
| 3. " C. S. Govindaraja Mudaliyar. | 9. Basheer Ahmad Sayeed Sahib Bahadur. |
| 4. " G. Harisarvottama Rao. | 10. Mr. A. Kaleswara Rao. |
| 5. Abdul Hamid Khan Sahib Bahadur. | 11. " G. Venkatarangam Nayudu. |
| 6. Mr. K. V. R. Swami. | |

Ayes 43. Noes 11.

The motion was carried and the grant was made.

The hon. Mr. M. R. SETURATNAM AYYAR:—"Mr. President, on the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor, I move

'that the Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 14,500 under Demand XXX—Civil Works—Transferred.'

"The accommodation in the Government Secondary and Training School for Girls, Vellore, is insufficient and there is no provision for a play-ground for the school. With a view to provide for extensions to the school building and also for a play-ground a site has been selected by the side of the school. A sum of Rs. 14,500 is required for the acquisition of the property, etc., and that is why the demand, Sir."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The question is that the Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 14,500 under Demand XXX—Civil Works—Transferred.

[The President]

[29th March 1928]

"Mr. P. Anjaneyulu wants to raise the question of a girls' school in Tenali or Guntur. I think it is out of order, unless there is any connexion between Guntur and Vellore."

* Mr. P. ANJANEYULU :—"Because it also relates to a school for girls, I thought I could move it, Sir."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"It is out of order."

Mr. BASHEER AHMAD SAYEED :—"Mr. President, Sir, I wish to oppose this demand, not on its merits, but on the ground that Rs. 14,500 is required for acquiring 1.53 acres. It is really wonderful, Mr. President, that the hon. the Minister should shut his eyes and then come forward with a demand for Rs. 14,500 to acquire 1.53 acres. I wonder in which country the cost of land is so high. I wonder, Sir, whether we are in India or elsewhere. The Ministers may possibly forget that they are not in this country, but we cannot afford to forget, Mr. President, that we are in this country and that we have to live and die with these very Ministers who are giving up our cause from time to time. I want to know, Sir, how exactly this figure has been arrived at, i.e., Rs. 14,500 for 1.53 acres. Is the amount inclusive of the building or is it merely for the land? Nothing is said in the explanatory note. This sort of desultory note reflects very badly on the Ministers and their Secretaries who do this kind of unsatisfactory work, Mr. President."

* Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI :—"Sir, if the site is really costly, some explanation ought to have been given. It is vaguely stated here Rs. 14,500 for 1.53 acres. Unless there are very extraordinary circumstances which have raised the cost of this site to such a high figure, it is not possible to imagine that in any part of this country land is sold at such a high rate as Rs. 10,000 per acre. Even in the deltaic districts, it is not so. No land is sold anywhere at more than Rs. 2,000 an acre, so far as I am aware. Unless Vellore is a very fertile and costly place, the cost cannot be so high. I am aware it is not a deltaic place and it is a dry land. Whenever land is acquired by the acre, the price could not be like that. Of course my friend the hon. the Minister will give some explanation to this House, and this House will support him, as we know from what has been happening. There must be some limit for this recklessness. When one acre of dry land is purchased for Rs. 10,000 some reason must be given. Simply the Government rely upon the reports that have been sent to them by the subordinates, and they seem to have been quite satisfied with the amount of money. Of course Ministers get very high salaries, and they think that Rs. 14,000 is nothing. The only thing we should consider is whether they are realizing what they are doing, and whether this land is worth purchasing. Another point raised is that the land is intended for a girls' school, not for a university or for a college where there may be hundreds of girls. I do not think anybody would like to have so much site as 1½ acres for play-ground for a girls' school. Unless you take special care to keep it neat and nice, I think it would be something like a wilderness. One and a half acres for a girls' school and a play-ground cannot be imagined. Half an acre would be quite sufficient, I think; it would come to 2,420 yards. There must be some limit to our expenditure. The object, of course, is a laudable object; but to have a play-ground for girls it is not necessary that we should have acres and acres of land and that we should waste money like this without any

29th March 1928]

[Mr. K. V. R. Swami]

consideration whatever. If this is a matter of urgency, we must see how much ground will be necessary and whether 1½ acres are required for girls to play. I think they would be bewildered to be let in a huge place like that. So, I oppose the grant."

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—“ Mr. President, Sir, this motion appears to be peculiarly conceived. The babe of a Minister must have felt that we were all babes to give a vote on a motion of this nature, or must have felt that he is so secure in his seat that he can play the pranks of a babe. This one acre and odd is to be a play-ground and the value fixed for it is Rs. 14,500. There is a sentence here in the note which is a bit significant: ‘ It is desirable to complete the acquisition at an early date to avoid paying higher rate of compensation.’ Whether this Rs. 14,500 means the aggregate amount at a rate fixed by the Government for this one acre and odd of ground, I cannot possibly say. There is the previous sentence to the last one which says: ‘ A sum of Rs. 14,500 is required for the acquisition of the property.’ I do not know what the property is on that piece of ground. It is likely that there are date palms or palmyra trees which the hon. the Minister for Excise may use for the benefit of the country and get money out of them. I do not know that—I am not in possession of facts—and it is for the hon. the Minister to say whether there is any property on that land worth Rs. 14,500 which is contemplated to be paid. If there is any property on that land, what kind of property is that? Is that property likely to fetch any money to the Government if it is disposed of and if the land is converted into a plain ?

“ It is inconceivable that a sum of Rs. 14,500 should be spent on the purchase of an acre and half of land and that in a place like Vellore. p.m. There must be some mistake somewhere; either the hon. Minister must have brought this demand without looking into it, he must have had no time or there must be something behind the whole affair. I am afraid this kind of bargain has become very common with this Government. Of course we have had a number of demands of this nature for lands, for buying quarters and in these matters there is the temptation for those who make proposals. Of course, the hon. the Minister may not be tempted sitting in his seat directly, the temptation need not be monetary but it may be on those who own the property, who appreciate the beauty of the place or it may be because of the nearness of the place to the officer or officers concerned. And unless the hon. Ministers make a very careful examination into the matter, investigate and scrutinize these things, such things may arise in future in large numbers. Of course, these are not apparent on the face of it. And of course, the hon. Minister will have some explanation to offer. But I wish to tell him plainly that he should not treat us like children and give us these small pieces of advertisement of his work and this is not creditable especially on the part of one who has kept to his seat in spite of the opinion of the country ”

Mr. P. ANJANEYULU :—“ Sir, I rise to make one or two observations. I say this may be quoted as a proof that the Transferred half has no policy behind it at least so far as education is concerned, and especially with regard to the education of women and girls. They are either too niggardly or appear to be too lavish, because they lack any well-propounded, any well-thought-out policy of education which is useful for the girls and the young women of this country. The sort of education that the proposal for this

[Mr. P. Anjaneyulu]

[29th March 1928]

play-ground indicates, I make bold to assert, is not the education that is conducive to the genius of this country or to develop the best in the girls of this country. Imagine one and a half acres of land is to be purchased for the use of girls as a play-ground. Have you ever heard such a thing before? I have had opportunities of starting and managing schools for girls--opportunities for managing some institutions. And I have come across girls' schools in my town where they engage themselves in outdoor games which do not require such a huge plot of land. In the case of boys such an extent of land may be necessary as they take to football and cricket, which games are not suited to the girls. The girls generally take to indoor games and if at all they take to any outdoor game they take to only tennis or badminton. For both of which games an acre and a half of land is surely not needed, not to say that the cost of this plot is out of proportion, unless the hon. Minister tells us that this locality is in the centre of Vellore. And from my knowledge I can make bold to say that no land, not even the best cultivable land, will be worth more than Rs. 4,000 an acre in any part of South India. But this is roughly two rupees a yard. Therefore both in extent and in cost it is out of all proportion to the requirements of the girls. On these grounds I oppose this demand."

* Mr. ABDUL HAMID KHAN :—“ Sir, if I rise to oppose this demand it is on the ground of policy. I am afraid Government have not been carefully informed when they launch upon purchasing property whether that plot of land is to be used for school or stores or for any other purpose. This is one of the instances where we see, as has been pointed out by Mr. Basheer Ahmad that when they go in for purchasing land they do not go into the question thoroughly, what the property is worth in a particular place and what Government has to pay for it. I thought, Sir, Government had acquired a reputation for lowering the estimate even below that prevailing in the market, but in this case it seems to be the contrary. The Government is going to purchase this plot of land at a much higher rate than that obtained in the market. Therefore there must be something behind it. There must be many other things than the mere monetary consideration. I feel sure that in purchasing these things extraneous considerations should not be given any room, for example, to please a local board member, or the president of the district board or a member of a party--in short I say such considerations should not weigh with the Government in making purchases of land. I know there are very many urgent demands on the finance of the Government. Government ought to have a well-thought-out scheme for spending its money. Here is a case where Government could have waited for some time and proceeded with more urgent needs. I know there is a long-standing demand from the Muhammadan College for an extension of the building. As at present the Government has been housing both the college and the school in one and the same building. Government ought to think out a scheme before it is proposed, whether they must first take into consideration the question of housing the school and college or whether they ought to provide for a play-ground which is not absolutely and immediately necessary. There is no place for even holding classes and thus when the demand is most pressing Government neglects it and spends a sum of Rs 14,000 in purchasing a site for play-ground. For these reasons I oppose this demand.”

Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA :—“ Sir, I move closure be adopted.”

29th March 1928]

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ Not accepted. The hon. the Chief Minister.”

* The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—“ I am surprised to see especially the two Muslim Members opposing this motion. If at all this demand benefits any community, it is their community. Evidently since they do not belong to the North Arcot district they are not paying any consideration at all to the Muslim population outside their own constituencies.”

Mr. BASHEER AHMAD SAYEED :—“ Sir, we are paying consideration to all Muslims alike. The hon. the Minister for Education is wrong.”

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ Order, order.”

* The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—“ It was in last July that training section for secondary grade women teachers was opened in the High School for Girls at Vellore. There was no accommodation for this training school and it had to be located in a rented building. This plot of ground is not only intended for the play-ground of the high school but also to build a building for the location of this training school. And therefore my hon. friends are wrong in thinking that we are giving more than what the land is worth to please a member of the taluk board or the president of the district board or any member of the Legislative Council. As a matter of fact, this plot of land belongs to a Brahman gentleman who does not belong to the Muslim community or is a president of a local body.”

Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA :—“ Not even a relation ? ”

* The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—“ He may be a relation of the hon. Member. As has been pointed out by one member the value of building site in this locality is rather high.”

Mr. BASHEER AHMAD SAYEED :—“ No, Sir.”

* The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—“ I have been told on good authority that this property will go up in value especially in view of the town-planning scheme that is being put into force in Vellore. We are told that this property is worth more than we intend to pay. It is said if we were to delay till next year this site may fetch double the sum that we are paying now.”

Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA :—“ Do the Government speculate ? ”

* The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—“ I don’t think the Government are speculating, but our action evidently gives room for hon. Members for speculation. Evidently the Swarajist Members like to speculate.”

Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA :—“ They will never allow it.”

* The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—“ That is why Government purchased this plot of land now.”

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ I take it that the House is ready to vote on this demand.”

Mr. BASHEER AHMAD SAYEED :—“ May I make an explanation ? ”

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ Order, order. The question is that Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 14,500 for the acquisition of a site for extension to the building of the Government Secondary and Training School for Girls, Vellore.”

The demand was put to vote and carried and the grant made.

[29th March 1928]

* The hon. Mr. M. R. SETURATNAM AYYAR :—“ On the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor, I move

‘ Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,900 under Demand XXX—Civili Works—Transferred for the employment of an Executive Engineer for the supervision of the reconstruction of the Cauvery bridge at Trichinopoly.’

“ The bridge over the Cauvery river at Trichinopoly was damaged by the 1924 floods and is unsafe for motor buses and heavy vehicles. It lies on the Great Southern Trunk Road and is one of the important bridges in the Presidency. An estimate amounting to Rs. 8·56 lakhs has been sanctioned for reconstructing the bridge and a sum of Rs. 5 lakhs is provided for the work in the budget for 1928-29. The Chief Engineer states that the work to be done is a most difficult one requiring great care and that a first-class engineer with experience is required solely for supervising the work.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ I take it the House is ready to vote on this. The question is Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,900 for the employment of an Executive Engineer for the supervision of the construction of the Cauvery bridge at Trichinopoly.”

The demand was put and carried and the grant made.

DEMAND XXXIV—AGENCY TRACTS.

* The hon. Sir NORMAN MAJORIBANKS :—“ On the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor, I move

‘ that Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 5,600 under Demand XXXIV—Agency Tracts for the construction of a causeway across the Turabaka vagu in the East Godavari Agency.’

“ Mr. President, Sir, it is the policy of the Government to develop the Agency tracts by improving communications and this is one of the items on the programme, namely, a causeway across the main obstacle to the traffic between Bhadrachalam and Dummagudem. The reason why this sum was not included in the budget estimates is that the estimate was received too late. Therefore we have to ask the House this sum for the year 1928-29 so that it may be utilized in the working season before the monsoon sets in.”

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ Mr. P. Anjaneyulu wants to move a cut motion to press on the attention of Government to make provision for another set of bridges on the canals in Tenali and another to draw attention to the inadequate irrigation facilities under tanks in Vinukonda and Palnad taluks in the Guntur district. I am afraid both of them are out of order.”

* Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI :—“ Sir, if I rise to oppose this it is not because this expenditure is not necessary but with the view to impress on the hon. Member in charge that there are other places which ought to be provided with bridges and I want to ask him why a causeway is not built across Seethapilli Gedda, East Godavari, which is on the main road to Chodavaram. When His Excellency went there they had to make special arrangements and I was told some months back arrangements would be made this year to put up a bridge. Few places have been provided with bridges and it is very difficult for the people to go to the Agency tracts which is rich in timber and other forest products.

29th March 1928] [Mr. K. V. R. Swami]

"I only request the hon. Member in charge to see that other bridges which are necessary and the absence of which cause a great inconvenience to the people may also be taken up very soon."

* Mr. P. ANJANEYULU :—"Sir, I also oppose this motion, Sir, for reasons similar to those put forward by the hon. Member Mr. Swami. Sir, I do not know anything about this bridge; it may or may not be absolutely urgent. I would tell the hon. Member in charge of this department that there is a great need for bridges in our district especially in the Tenali taluk near Chundur and Pedapudi. When Sir Patro visited my district he realized the great necessity for bridges in the Tenali taluk, especially in the Tenali town and at Pedapudi. This question of the bridges has been so often discussed in this House before. The Government which is a happy family now may put their heads together and see that at least some bridges are constructed in order to facilitate the crossing of the canals, which thing is very difficult for ten months in the twelve months of the year. Plans and estimates for a bridge at Pedapudi are ready. But for some reason or other they have been postponed every year. This is the third year that I am making this request for bridges. I request the hon. Member to take into consideration the question of bridges and causeways in other parts of my district as early as possible, especially the bridges over the big drains in my district."

* The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—"Mr. President, Sir, I am only in charge of the works in the Agency. I welcome the criticisms of the hon. Member Mr. Swami. The Government want to carry out more works in this locality, but is limited by want of establishment and the difficulty of getting labour in these parts. I hope the other points mentioned by the hon. Members will receive the attention of the Member concerned."

The demand was put to the House and carried and the grant made.

* The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—"Mr. President, Sir, on the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor, I move

'that Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 20,000 under Demand XXXIV—Agency Tracts for the construction of quarters for the Executive Engineer, Koraput division, at Koraput.'

"Sir, at present the headquarters of the Executive Engineer is at Waltair, miles away from the scene of his work. In pursuance of the policy of carrying out and improving communications and road works in the Agency, we wish to locate the officer in the midst of his charge. To do that we have to construct for him quarters. Here again, owing to delay in receipt of the estimates we could not include this item in the budget. In order not to lose the working season of the year, I ask the House to vote this sum as a further grant."

The demand was put to the House and carried and the grant made.

DEMAND XXXVI—LOANS AND ADVANCES BY PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT.

* The hon. Mr. T. E. MOIR :—"Sir, on the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor, I move

'that Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 12,400 under Demand XXXVI—Loans and Advances by the Provincial Government.'

[Mr. T. E. Moir]

[29th March 1928]

"Sir, this is to enable the Nellore Municipal Council to make advances to the municipal servants drawing under Rs. 100 a month as loans to enable them to meet the loss of stores and provisions and other property during the cyclone of November last. In the case of Government servants also similar loans were made and it is proposed to provide this sum to enable the Nellore Municipal Council to advance money to their servants on exactly similar terms."

* Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI :— "Sir, just one word. I do not want to oppose the motion. I want to know whether this is all the amount asked for by the municipality. The amount seems to be very small. There cannot be a more laudable object than this. We cannot blame the Government if this is all that the municipality has asked for; but if they have asked for a larger sum, I hope the hon. Member will ask for greater amount. It is only a temporary accommodation to the poor people who have suffered so much on account of the cyclone and they will have perhaps to return the sum with interest and so the hon. Member may afford to be liberal."

* The hon. Mr. T. E. MOIR :— "Sir, the amount entered in the demand is based on a detailed statement submitted by the municipality containing the number of their servants who desire to avail themselves of these facilities and their pay."

The demand was put to the House and carried; and the grant was made.

* The hon. Mr. T. E. MOIR :— "Sir, on the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor, I move

'that Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 15,000 under Demand XXXVI—Loans and Advances by Provincial Government.'

"Sir, this is to enable a union of milk supply societies in the neighbourhood of Poonamallee, 14 in number, to purchase two motor vans in order to bring their milk and other produce into the Madras City. An old motor lorry belonging to the Government was placed at their disposal and it has now become unserviceable. The Registrar recommends that two motor vans may be purchased for this society."

The demand was put and carried and the grant made.

The House adjourned to meet again at 11 o'clock the next day.

R. V. KRISHNA AYYAR,
Secretary to the Legislative Council.

APPENDIX.

[Vide answer to question No. 1804 asked by Mr. A. B. Shetty at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 29th March 1928, page 146 supra.]

The Assistant Directors in the I and V Circles have semi-independent charge of East and West Godavari districts and the Tanjore district respectively while the Deputy Directors have general control over them and have in addition direct charge of districts, Ganjam and Vizagapatam in the I Circle and Trichinopoly in the V Circle. The Assistant Directors in the III and IV Circles are also in charge of districts but all financial and other powers vest in the Deputy Directors. In other circles, the Assistant Directors have no special charge but are helping the Deputy Directors.